## SOUTHCENTRAL REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

## PUBLIC MEETING

## VOLUME II

Alaska Islands and Ocean Visitor Center Homer, Alaska November 7, 2017 8:30 a.m.

## COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Greg Encelewski, Chairman
Judy Caminer
Eleanor Dementi
Ricky Gease
Ed Holston
Andrew McLaughlin
Michael Opheim
Diane Selanoff
Dan Stevens
Gloria Stickwan

Regional Council Coordinator, Donald Mike

Recorded and transcribed by:

Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2 Anchorage, AK 99501 907-243-0668/sahile@gci.net

Page 188 PROCEEDINGS 1 2 3 (Homer, Alaska - 11/7/2017) 4 5 (On record) 6 7 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, good 8 morning, everyone. I'm going to go ahead and call the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council back in session 9 10 this morning. 11 12 And Donald, do you got anything before 13 we get started? 14 15 Thank you, Mr. Chair. MR. MIKE: briefly. We passed out some additional reading 16 materials for your information and I just handed out a 17 new updated fall 2018 Regional Advisory Council meeting 18 calendar for later on's discussions. 19 20 Thank you, Mr. Chair. 21 2.2 23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. 24 25 Okay. Without further adieu then, if 26 there's nothing else pressing we're going to go ahead and continue on our proposals. And we're on Wildlife 27 28 Proposal 18-55. 29 30 And Tom, you go right ahead. 31 MR. EVANS: Good morning, Mr. Chair and 32 Members of the Council. For the record, I'm Tom Evans 33 34 and I work with OSM as a wildlife biologist. 35 Proposal WP18-55 can be found on page 36 175 of your Board book. The proposal was submitted by 37 the Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge and requests that 38 the fall and winter moose seasons be extended from 39 August 24th to September 20th and November 1st to 40 February 28th to August 20th to September 30th and 41 November 1st to April 30th, in a portion of Unit 12 42 within the Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge and 43 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve north and 44 east of the Pickerel Lake Winter Trail. 45 46 The moose population in 2012 in the 47 Tetlin portion in the southeastern portion of Unit 12 48 based on a minimum population of 4,773 in 2012 was 49 50

between 4,883 and 6,571. That averages -- that comes out to about .08 to 1.1 moose per square mile.

Population surveys are conducted every three to four years, which makes it difficult to respond to trends in the population in a timely manner. Population surveys have not been done in the Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge for the past five years because of poor survey conditions.

Moose densities have been relatively stable within the southeastern portion in the northeast survey area since 2008. The bull/cow ratio was 52 per 100 cows, which is above the State management guidelines of 40, and the cow/calf ratio dropped from 33 to 18 from 2003 to 2012. Usually less than 20 calves per 100 cows may indicate a population starting to head into decline.

21 22

The State's sustainable harvest rate for Unit 12 is three to four percent, which was based on the 2010/2014 population estimate, would be 135 to 193 animals at three percent or 180 to 257 animals at four percent. An average of 132 moose were harvested from 2006 to 2015. In 2015, 163 moose were harvested. Approximately 30 percent of the moose are taken by Unit 12 residents.

Most of the moose in this area are hunted under the State regulations. On average, only two moose were taken from 2016 to 2018 under the Federal registration hunt FM1203. If adopted, this proposal would increase the opportunity for Federally qualified users in the area to have more opportunity to harvest moose.

 $$\operatorname{\mathsf{OSM}}'\!\operatorname{\mathsf{s}}$  preliminary conclusion is to support Proposal WP18-55.

Thank you.

And I'll entertain questions.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty.

Thank you, Tom.

Questions for Tom on the presentation

49 proposal.

```
Page 190
                     (No comments)
 2
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Either they're
 3
 4
     all asleep or they're all satisfied. So very good.
 5
                     (Laughter)
 6
 7
 8
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: We're going to
 9
     move on then.
10
11
                     Thank you, Tom.
12
13
                     MS. STICKWAN:
                                    During consultation, did
     anybody call into the meeting?
14
15
16
                     MR. EVANS: Do you have anything on
     that, Donald?
17
18
19
                     MR. MIKE: Yes. For the record, this
     is Donald Mike.
                     We had a consultation process that
20
     started September 14th and it was -- notification was
21
2.2.
     sent by Orville Lind for Tribal and ANCSA consultation.
23
     And I don't believe we had anything from Tetlin folks
     that called in.
24
25
26
                     MR. LIND: Mr. Chair, this is Orville
     Lind, Native Liaison, OSM. I can answer that.
27
28
29
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                            Okay, Orville.
30
     Go ahead.
31
                     MR. LIND: Yeah.
                                       Good morning, Chair
32
     and Council Members. Yeah. We conducted consultation
33
     for the Region on September 14th and no one called in
34
35
     for that session, both Tribal or ANCSA.
36
37
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                            Okay.
                                                   Thank you.
38
39
                     MR. LIND: You're welcome.
40
41
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Judy.
42
                     MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair and Donald or
43
     Orville, I thought at the beginning of the meeting
44
     there was a comment from Northway.
45
46
47
                     MR. MIKE: Yes. There's a comment from
48
     Northway.
49
50
```

```
Page 191
                     MS. CAMINER:
                                   Oh, okay.
 2
                     MR. MIKE: Yeah. Yeah. I'm sorry.
 3
 4
     There is a comment from Northway.
 5
                     Thanks for the reminder.
 6
 7
                     There's a Tribal comment from Jamie,
 8
     from Northway Tribal Council, expressing subsistence
 9
10
     concern on expanding moose harvest in WP18-55.
     mentioned that her Tribal members are having difficulty
11
     in finding moose because there are low densities in
12
     their harvest areas. While they intend that the
13
     Proposal 18-55 is to align regulations with neighboring
14
     areas and provide additional subsistence opportunities
15
     for local residents, Northway Council does not agree
16
     that the proposal meets such stated intent and will in
17
     fact have negative consequences to their moose
18
     harvesting opportunities.
19
20
                     Also, she mentioned that law
21
2.2
     enforcement is lacking and more aircraft will be used,
     which they do not support.
23
24
25
                     Thank you, Mr. Chair.
26
27
                     MR. LIND: My apologies. I just saw
28
     that.
29
30
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                            Thank you.
31
                     MR. MIKE: And Mr. Chair, if I can ask
32
     folks online to please identify yourself. And I just
33
     want to remind you to have your phones muted.
34
35
                     Thank you.
36
37
                     You can get started, online folks.
38
39
40
                     Introductions again.
41
                     MS. CELLARIUS: This is Barbara
42
     Cellarius, at Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and
43
     Preserve, in Copper Center.
44
45
                                            This is Erica
                     MS. MCCALL VALENTINE:
46
     McCall Valentine, the interim social scientist through
47
     the Partners for Fisheries Monitoring Program at AITRC.
48
49
50
```

```
Page 192
                     MR. LIND: Orville Lind, Native Liaison
     for the Office of Subsistence Management.
 2
 3
 4
                     MS. DEMENTI: This is Eleanor Dementi.
 5
                     MR. BURCH: Mark Burch, Department of
 6
 7
     Fish and Game, in Palmer.
 8
                     MR. MIKE:
                                Thank you.
 9
10
11
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thanks, Donald.
     Good call.
12
13
                     Okay, Judy. Did you have a follow-up
14
15
     question on that?
16
                     MS. CAMINER:
17
                                   No.
18
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
19
                                           Okay. Are we
     ready to go. We're going to go ahead and report
20
     Tribes.
21
2.2
23
                     Any Tribes.
24
25
                     MR. MIKE: There's the one from
26
     Northway I read into the record.
27
28
                     Thank you, Mr. Chair.
29
30
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Correct.
31
32
                     Okay. Any other. ANCSA Corps.
33
34
                     (No comments)
35
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. How about
36
     the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.
37
38
39
                     MR. BURCH: Mr. Chair, this is Mark
     Burch, in Palmer, if there's no one there in the room
40
41
     to address this.
42
                     MR. RINALDI: Good morning, Mr. Chair,
43
     Members of the Advisory Council. My name is Todd
44
     Rinaldi. For the record, I'm with the Alaska
45
     Department of Fish and Game in Region 4, Division of
46
     Wildlife Conservation.
47
48
49
                     The Department sees no biological
50
```

Page 193 concerns identified with this proposal. The bull to cow ratio estimates from the two most recent surveys 2 were above the management objective of at least 40 3 4 bulls to 100 cows and were estimated at 62 bulls per 100 cows and 52 to 100 cows in 2008 and 2012 5 respectively. Moose densities in the area are 6 7 relatively low, but stable, at approximately .55 to .65 moose per square mile. 8 9 The extension of the season would 10 11 likely result in little additional harvest due to the antlered bull bag limit and the fact that few bulls 12 typically retain their antlers late into winter and 13 spring. In addition, although the extension of the 14 15 fall season would result in ten more days of hunting opportunity during the late part of the season when 16 bulls are typically trying to increase rutting 17 activity, it would likely result in relatively little 18 additional harvest due to the difficult access in the 19 20 area. 21 2.2 The Department is neutral on this proposal because it will not create biological concerns 23 for the moose population; however, it should be noted 24 25 that extending the moose season beyond this December period would likely result in the accident harvest of 26 some cow moose. 27 28 29 Thank you for your time. 30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Tom. 31 Very good. 32 33 34 Questions for State. 35 (No comments) 36 37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Federal. 38 39 40 (No comments) 41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any Tribal 42 agencies. 43 44 45 (No comments) 46 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: How about 47 48 advisory groups. 49

```
Page 194
                      (No comments)
 2
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Other regional
 3
 4
     councils' comments.
 5
 6
                     (No comments)
 7
 8
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Fish and Game
 9
     Advisory Committee.
10
11
                     (No comments)
12
13
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Subsistence
     Resource Commission.
14
15
16
                     MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair, if Judy's
     not there, I can read the comments from the Wrangell-
17
     St. Elias National....
18
19
                     (Laughter)
20
21
2.2
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                            Judy's here and
     she's kind of grinning about that. But she's up there
23
     now, Barbara.
24
25
                                              Thanks.
26
                     MS. CELLARIUS: Great.
27
28
                     (Laughter)
29
30
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.
                                                       Yeah.
31
                     MS. PUTERA: Mr. Chair, my name is Judy
32
     Putera, Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve.
33
34
     I'm reading the comments from the SRC.
35
                     The Wrangell-St. Elias National Park
36
     Subsistence Resource Commission opposes WP18-55. In
37
     terms of the fall hunt, the SRC did not support
38
     extending the season into the rut. With respect to the
39
     winter season, that season is already three months
40
     long. Five months is too long for the winter season.
41
     Extending the season later in the spring when the days
42
     are longer and it is easier to get out on snowmachines
43
     could result in increase harvest.
44
45
                     The Commission also heard public
46
     comments opposing the proposal.
47
48
49
                     Thank you.
50
```

```
Page 195
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Questions.
 2
 3
                     (No comments)
 4
 5
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Donald, you got a
     summary of written public comments?
 6
 7
 8
                     MR. MIKE: Yes, Mr. Chair. You'll find
 9
     your written comments on -- beginning on page 195 in
10
     your meeting materials.
11
                     AITRC is neutral on WP18-55.
12
13
                     And we had general comments from two
14
     individuals on Proposal 18-55 and they state please
15
     consider more important factors in your decision than
16
     matching seasons such as actual moose count trends,
17
     ability of the Refuge to patrol, increased hunting by
18
     locals in the future due to Alaska's difficult economic
19
20
     conditions. These factors must be considered before
     matching the seasons.
21
2.2
23
                     Thank you, Mr. Chair.
24
25
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                            Thank you,
     Donald.
26
27
28
                     Any public testimony.
29
30
                     (No comments)
31
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Regional
32
     Council's recommendation.
33
34
35
                     MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.
36
37
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Judy.
38
39
                     MS. CAMINER: I move that we support
40
     the proposal.
41
42
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: We've got a
43
     motion to put the proposal.....
44
45
                     MR. OPHEIM: I second.
46
47
                     MS. CAMINER: Excuse me. I should have
48
     said adopt the proposal instead of.....
49
50
```

```
Page 196
                     MR. OPHEIM: Yeah.
 2
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Is there a
 3
 4
     second.
 5
                     MR. OPHEIM:
 6
                                  Second.
 7
 8
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Seconded by
     Michael.
 9
10
11
                     Okay.
12
                     We do have it on the table here for
13
     discussion.
14
15
16
                     Who wants to go first.
17
18
                     Go ahead, Ricky.
19
                     MR. GEASE: Is anybody from Tetlin
20
     here. I'd like to know who -- it seems to me like
21
2.2
     there's not a lot of local support for this, but where
     did they come up with this proposal.
23
24
25
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: It's kind of
     confusing.
26
                 Yeah.
27
28
                     MS. STICKWAN: I heard that it was
     Tetlin Wildlife Refuge that wrote the proposal and
29
     Jamie Bonde (ph) talked to me about this proposal.
30
     She's originally from that area. And she opposed it
31
     because she said that moose will be taken where they
32
     hunt, which is in their local area. They don't -- they
33
34
     say that people will go out into the hills and the --
     because they have access with their ATVs and they don't
35
     have that. And they will take all the moose. And when
36
     the moose start coming down, there won't be hardly any
37
     moose left. So they -- that's why they opposed it.
38
     And they don't see hardly any moose there right now as
39
40
     it is.
41
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. It's kind
42
     of a difficult situation here.
43
44
                     You know, on one hand we're here and
45
     it's not a conservation concern. It would give more
46
     opportunity. On the other hand, we're hearing that it
47
     may hamper moose for locals if we do.
48
49
50
```

So the other factor that I heard was that it may be such slight that it wouldn't really matter one way or the other, so I think we need to keep that into consideration, too.

Anyway, that's my comments.

Judy, go ahead.

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, thank you. I guess I'm wondering if there's, you know, any guidance from the biologists about the concern about the April 30th date. If cutting that back would help satisfy some of the concerns at least about the timing.

And I guess just a comment for the future. We've had a couple of proposals regarding the Refuge and it would be good maybe in advance to have some Refuge people on the phone when we know we're going to be discussing proposals. Because it's a bit out of our area so it would be good to hear firsthand. But it certainly affects our residents. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone else. Comment on this.

Go ahead, Rick.

MR. GEASE: So of the things that we should be discussion and justification, is the recommendation supported by substantial evidence of, you know, traditional support, knowledge. It doesn't seem like this one is. It seems like the local community is not in support of this proposal and it seems like Tetlin is, but nobody's really here to expand on the justification why, so I'm having difficulty with this one.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Gloria, did you have comments?} CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Gloria, did you$ 

MS. STICKWAN: Well, I believe she said they weren't consulted. The attempts were made, but she said they weren't. I don't know what happened there.

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, I wonder if we could have Donald -- could you please read again the Northway comment? Because, you know, I wasn't sure if

maybe they thought -- I don't know if I heard this or not. That, you know, the earlier expansion of the dates in the fall was okay, but maybe later was not. So maybe you could just read them again one more time, please.

MR. MIKE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Before I get started, I want to remind folks online please put your phone on mute. We're hearing some background noise. If you don't have a mute button, hit star 6.

Thank you.

21 22

 This is a comment from Jamie, from Northway. And she states the Tribal Council expressed subsistence concern on expanding moose harvest in WP18-55. She mentioned that her Tribal members are having difficulty in finding moose because there are low densities in their harvest areas. While they intend that the Proposal 18-55 is to align regulations with nearby areas and provide additional subsistence opportunities for local residents, Northway Council does not agree that their proposal meets such stated intent and will in fact have negative consequences to their moose harvest opportunities.

She also mentioned that law enforcement is lacking and more aircraft will be used, which they do not support.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,

Donald.

 You know, there's a -- and I had talked to Judy about this earlier. Sometimes in the past we had deferred these kind of situations to the home region a little more closely involved, so that's another option.

I'd just throw it out there for you.

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$  STICKWAN: I just think we should act on it because they did write comments to us.

They are concerned about it.

```
Page 199
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                            That's fine.
 2
                     Someone call the question and we'll
 3
 4
     take a vote.
 5
                     MR. GEASE: Question.
 6
 7
 8
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Ouestion's been
 9
              All in favor of the proposal, signify saying
     called.
10
     aye.
11
12
                     (No supporting votes)
13
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
14
                                            Opposed.
15
16
                     IN UNISON: Aye.
17
18
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                            Fails.
19
                     Okay. Next we have statewide proposal.
20
     And we've got 18-51. Oh, damn. I've got to put -- oh,
21
2.2
     excuse me.
23
                     (Laughter)
24
25
26
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Next, we've got
     18-51, statewide proposal. Modify bear bait and
27
     restrictions.
28
29
30
                     Tom, are you going to do that?
31
                     MR. EVANS: Yes.
32
33
34
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.
                                                   Thank you.
35
                     MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
36
     Again for the record, my name is Tom Evans.
37
38
39
                     Proposal 18-51 was submitted by the
     Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory
40
     Council and it requests that the Federal statewide bear
41
     baiting restrictions be aligned with the State
42
     regulations, specifically in the use of biodegradable
43
     materials. This can be found on page 198 of your Board
44
     books or your Council books.
45
46
47
                     The proponent states that the current
     Federal bear baiting restrictions are much more
48
     restrictive than the State's and do not provide for a
49
50
```

Federal subsistence priority. Currently under the Federal regulations only biodegradable materials may be used for bait. Only the head, bones, viscera or skin of legally harvested fish and wildlife may be used for bait.

The proponent proposes to align Federal and State bear baiting restrictions in order to reduce regulatory complexity, reduce user confusion, and allow the baiting with items such as dog food, popcorn, baked goods, greased syrup that have been traditionally used as bear bait by Federally qualified subsistence users and are currently allowed under the State regulations.

Federal regulations for bear baiting have remained the same since they were adopted from the State regulations in 1990. Currently, black bears may be taken at bait stations under Federal regulation in all units except Units 1C, 4, 8, 9, 10, 14, 18, 22, 23, and 26. Brown bear may be taken at bait stations in Units 11 and 12 and 25D.

 In 2012, the National Park Service published the final rule prohibiting the take of black or brown bears over bait on national preserves under the State regulations.

In 2017, the National Park Service published the final rule eliminating the types of bait that may be used for taking bears under the Federal Subsistence Regulations to native fish or wildlife remains from natural mortality or parts not required to be salvaged from a legal harvest. Wrangell-St. Elias has some exceptions to that final rule.

And I might have mentioned preserves before. That probably is parks versus preserves.

The use of bait stations is controversial. Those that support bear baiting state that it allows hunters to be more selective in terms of sex and in identifying, you know, family groups when they come into the stations and more humane. It facilitates clean kills by a bow and it allows hunters with limited mobility to participate in the hunt.

Those that oppose cite safety concerns from food conditioning. And we hear that repeatedly from many, many folks.

If adopted, this proposal would permit the use of scent lures on Federal public lands administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service, BLM, and the U.S. Forest Service. However, currently scent lures are not defined under the Federal regulations. If scent lures are not defined, than any materials or chemicals, including toxic and non-biodegradable materials, could be used at registered bait stations.

So the proposed definition -- so we propose a definition of a scent lure. And this is the definition. Scent lure means any biodegradable material to which biodegradable scent is applied or infused.

If adopted, the Federally qualified subsistence users could use any biodegradable material as well as scent lures at registered bait stations on Federal public lands again administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service, BLM or the U.S. Forest Service. A bear bait is limited to native fish and wildlife remains on national park service lands. If adopted, this proposal would align the State and Federal baiting regulations.

The requested changes are already permitted under the State regulation and it's not expected that there would be any differences in the bear harvests, populations or subsistence uses or habituation of bears to human foods from this proposal.

OSM's preliminary conclusion is to support this proposal and support 18-51 with a modification to establish a definition for scene lure and clarify the regulatory language.

 The modified regulation for the definitions of scent lure would be as follows — it means any biodegradable material which is biodegradable scent that is applied or infused. You may use any biodegradable materials for bait. If fish and wildlife is used as bait, only the head, bones, viscera or skin of legally harvested fish and wildlife. The skinned carcasses or furbearers and unclassified wildlife may be used, except in Units 7 and 15, which are units that's covered by this Region. Fish or fish parts may not be used as bait. Scent lures may be used at registered bait stations.

Page 202 The terms game, fur animals, and small game are not defined under the Federal regulations, but 2 are included in the Federal definition of wildlife. 3 While the term big game is defined under the Federal 4 regulations it is also included within the Federal 5 definition of wildlife. 6 7 8 This proposal basically allows for the greater use of a variety of baits and identifies scent 9 10 lures in Federal regulations. 11 12 Thank you. 13 Any questions. 14 15 16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Tom. I'm sure we've got some questions here. 17 18 19 Judy, do you want to start. 20 MS. CAMINER: Can you remind us, Tom, 21 2.2 why we have the exceptions in 7 and 15, please. 23 MR. EVANS: Those exceptions make sense 24 25 because there's a lot of fishing that goes on in the Kenai area. And they don't want to use fish because 26 that will definitely attract bears. 27 28 29 Bears are already coming in to get fish 30 and whatnot, so I think that's the reason. 31 32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Thank you. 33 34 Ricky. 35 MR. GEASE: You made a comment that 36 there was -- you had received comments from -- it was 37 commenter received comments from people not wanting to 38 get food conditioned bears. Are those comments from 39 subsistence users or is those just people who are not 40 41 out in the areas where people are hunting for subsistence purposes. 42 43 Can you kind of clarify who's making 44 those comments and where they reside and what 45 activities they engage in. 46 47 48 MR. EVANS: Those comments come from a variety of people. They do come from some subsistence 49

users that don't want to encourage bears getting closer to communities and are concerned about bear safety, but they also come from outside people who don't like bear baiting particularly at all or -- and then it comes from, you know, some of the hunters and other people that just don't agree with -- you know, feel like that food conditioning is -- you know, that it's not a good thing to do just in general.

Yeah.

So it's a variety of people throughout the whole spectrum.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I've got a question, Tom. Bear baiting -- I talked a little bit to the Refuge about bear baiting. I don't know. Maybe Todd will talk about it. But, you know, in bear baiting, are they targeting just the biggest and the best and the largest? Is there any effect from that that you know of?

MR. EVANS: I do not know of any effect and I think that just varies to the hunter. You know, subsistence hunters are probably going for bears for food and some of the sporthunters are probably looking for big bears. So....

MR. GEASE: Is there any data on food conditioning of bears where there's bears get food conditioned? Because I know on the Kenai Peninsula a lot of time and education goes towards garbage cans, bears that are in urban areas, bears that are in dumps, bears that are, you know, finding fish carcasses on the sides of rivers that have been fileted out or poorly fileted out. I haven't heard too many things of food conditioned bears around Cooper Landing from bait stations getting into interfaces with humans in human residences.

It seems to me a lot of what I hear is people leaving garbage out and bears getting into garbage cans, but is there actual data that supports the idea that bear baiting out in the field translates into food conditioned bears that they go into populated areas and that's the reason why they're food conditioned bears?

MR. EVANS: There is some. There are

some articles in the literature that talk about bear baiting and the effect that they of developing food conditioned bears. A lot of that stuff seems to come I mean from Yellowstone and some other places like where we had bear dumps. And they've closed the bear dumps or closed the trash that the bears -- attracted all the bears -- was a tourist attraction as well. But yeah, there are some things where poor management of food resources, you know, with the garbage and everything certainly attracts bear.

Bait stations -- it's a variable thing. It depends on the area and what people are doing as to whether it causes a problem or not. So it's not just like just because you have a bear baiting station it's causing a problem.

So it's variable on that in that sense.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Andy. Go

21 ahead.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Just for our review, bear baiting stations already have a proximity restriction regulation. They can't be so close to dwelling, roads, campgrounds, human activity places anyhow, correct?

Can you review some of that?

MR. EVANS: That is correct. The distance I don't know off the top of my head, but I can look that up for you.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I think half mile.

MR. EVANS: Yeah. It is a distance.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Did that answer

your question?

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Thanks,

We'll move on and see what else we come up with here, I guess.

 Tom.

Page 205 Tribes. 1 2 (No comments) 3 4 5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any ANCSA Corps. 6 7 (No comments) 8 9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Let's see 10 what the State could tell us about bear baiting. 11 ought to have a good story here. 12 13 Thank you. 14 15 (Laughter) 16 MR. RINALDI: Mr. Chair, Members of the 17 Council, thank you again for the opportunity to speak. 18 My name is Todd Rinaldi, with the Alaska Department of 19 Fish and Game, for the record. 20 21 This proposal would align State and 2.2 23 Federal regulations. Little additional take of bears is expected. There would be no expected conservation 24 25 concerns and it should be noted that there no empirical evidence that currently exists to support the assertion 26 that the use of human food sources in bear baiting 27 habituates or food conditions bears or increases human 2.8 wildlife interactions in Alaska. And it's likely to 29 say it's also in North America. The articles in the 30 literature either hypothesize this concept or address 31 food conditioning stemming from non-bear baiting 32 situations. 33 34 35 Therefore, the Department supports this proposal because it reduces regulatory complexity and 36 user confusion by allowing Federally qualified users to 37 bait bears with additional food attractants that are 38 currently allowed under State regulations. 39 40 41 Thank you. 42 43 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Very good. 44 Questions for Todd. 45 46 Go ahead, Rick. 47 48 MR. GEASE: Does the State have that 49 50

```
Page 206
     regulation for scent and is that aligned also?
 2
                                           Currently under
                     MR. RINALDI: Yeah.
 3
 4
     State regulations scent lures can be used.
 5
                     Yeah.
 6
 7
 8
                     MR. GEASE: But what I'm saying is the
 9
     definition the same for scent? How it's defined?
10
11
                     MR. RINALDI: I don't know if it's
     exactly the same. I don't know if Tom can speak to
12
13
     that.
14
15
                     MR. EVANS:
                                 I don't know.
16
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: It's to be
17
     determined, I guess, huh.
18
19
                     Any other questions for State.
20
21
2.2
                     Go ahead, Rick.
23
                     MR. GEASE: So just to clarify, of the
24
25
     different areas where this would be implemented on
     Federal lands, the State has no conservation concerns?
26
27
28
                     MR. RINALDI: We have a -- through the
29
     Chair. Member Gease, we have no conservation concerns.
     And to further elaborate on your questions earlier, you
30
     know, bear baiting exists in some highly populated
31
     areas such as the Matanuska Valley and we see no
32
     increase or relationship with bear baiting and human
33
34
     food conditioning bears or bear encounters, conflicts.
35
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                            Thank you.
36
37
     Thank you.
38
39
                     MR. RINALDI:
                                   Yep.
40
41
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Federal.
42
43
                     (No comments)
44
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Tribal.
45
46
                     (No comments)
47
48
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Other regional
49
50
```

```
Page 207
     councils.
 2
 3
                     (No comments)
 4
 5
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Fish and Game
     Advisory Committee.
 6
 7
 8
                     (No comments)
 9
10
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Subsistence
11
     Resource Commission.
12
13
                     MS. MCBURNEY:
                                    Thank you, Mr. Chair.
     For the record, my name is Mary McBurney, with the
14
     National Park Service, and I have the comment on WP18-
15
     51 from the Denali Subsistence Resource Commission.
16
17
                     The Denali National Park Subsistence
18
     Resource Commission does not support WP18-51 as
19
     written. The Denali SRC adopted WP18-51 to align the
20
     Federal regulations with the State and amended the
21
2.2
     proposal to include only natural bait. The SRC is
     concerned about bears getting accustomed to people
23
     food. If bears get used to non-natural bait, they are
24
25
     going to be more aggressive to campers.
                                               The SRC does
     not want bears acclimated to human food on Federal
26
     lands. Although currently non-natural bait is not
27
     allowed on NPS lands, it is anticipated that if non-
28
     natural bait is legal on Federal lands there will be
29
30
     future pressure to allow non-natural baiting on NPS
     lands.
31
32
                     Other parks have severe problems with
33
34
     bears. And Denali is lucky due to management and
     education efforts that we have a lack of acclimation.
35
     It is difficult to reduce acclimation.
36
37
                     And that concludes the comment.
38
39
40
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                            Thank you.
41
                     Judy.
42
43
                     MS. PUTERA: Mr. Chair, this is Judy
44
     Putera, Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve.
45
46
                     The Wrangell-St. Elias National Park
47
     Subsistence Resource Commission supports WP18-15, as
48
     modified by the Office of Subsistence Management.
49
50
```

Page 208 Aligning State and Federal definitions of bait will simplify the regulations and make them easier for users 2 to understand. 3 4 5 Thank you. 6 7 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. 8 9 Questions for Resource Commission or 10 the park. 11 12 (No comments) 13 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Donald, if 14 15 you'll do the summary, we'll -- and I do have a public 16 comment. 17 18 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 19 You'll find your written comments beginning on page 208 20 in your meeting materials. 21 2.2. Sean McGuire opposes WP18-51. 23 should be no human food or any human substance to bait any animals. The last thing we want is to habituate 24 bears or any wild animal to human food. 25 26 And another comment from Jim and 27 Suzanne Kowalsky. They wish to strongly oppose 28 Proposal 51 which proposes to allow Federally qualified 29 subsistence hunters to add the use of human produced 30 foods and scent to the presently permitted use of 31 biodegradable materials used to bait bears on all 32 Federal public lands. 33 34 35 So they strongly oppose WP18-51. 36 37 And finally we have a comment from 38 Francis Mauer opposing Proposal 18-51 and stating that human refuse will habituate bears to humans and 39 contribute to human-bear conflicts and expose innocent 40 41 people to risks from bears that no longer fear humans. 42 Thank you, Mr. Chair. 43 44 45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, 46 Donald. 47 48 Go ahead. Come on back up, Todd. 49 50

MR. RINALDI: Through the Chair. Thank you again. I just wanted to answer representative member Gease's question about scent. And I didn't want to answer before I was fully aware of what I thought the answer was. And yeah, the State does not currently have a definition of scent.

So I just wanted to clarify that.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.

Alrighty. We have one public

testimony.

Dave Bachrach, if you want to come up.

MR. BACHRACH: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Council, for taking my testimony today.

I'm asking you to oppose WP18-51. An ongoing issue of concern in public education on the Kenai Peninsula has been the conditioning of bears to attract. And it's like unsecured human food -- garbage, barbecues, freezers, and even bird feeders that may attract bears to homes, businesses, recreation areas, which could result in human-bear conflicts.

For about a decade I was a member of the Kenai Brown Bear Committee, which worked to reduce human bear conflicts and DLPs on the Kenai Peninsula. The committee had representatives from ADF&G, NPS, Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service, Kenai Peninsula Borough, local chambers of commerce, Safari Club International, local industry, conservation groups, and area residents.

So I'm saying there was a whole lot of people involved over a long period of time.

Some of the programs and activities that have occurred on the Kenai Peninsula include ADF&G established a wildlife conservation community program which includes Kenai, Soldotna, Seward, Homer, Cooper Landing, Moose Pass, and Hope to raise awareness of food conditioning of bears. Grants were obtained so many residents could get bear-resistant trash containers at little or no cost. The month of April

Page 210 was established as bear awareness month in many communities on the Kenai Peninsula. 2 3 4 The public safety concerns posed by food conditioned bears are universally recognized by 5 natural resource agencies. Food conditioned bears are 6 far more likely to be a danger to humans than bears 7 that are not food conditioned. Food conditioning of 8 bears tends to increase the likelihood of a bear being 9 10 killed in defense of life and property. 11 12 Baiting of bears in general is in stark contrast with the best management practices and 13 standard public educational messaging on the issues of 14 food and bears. Community values and public safety 15 concerns should be given a preference over a desire to 16 simplify a regulation statewide. 17 18 19 Thank you for considering my comments. 20 21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Dave. 2.2 23 Questions for Dave. 24 25 (No comments) 26 27 MR. BACHRACH: Thank you. 28 29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you much. 30 Okay. Next, Regional Council 31 recommendation. 32 33 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. 34 35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Judy. 36 37 38 MS. CAMINER: I'll move to adopt the 39 proposal. 40 41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: We have a motion to adopt the proposal. 42 43 44 Is there a second. 45 46 MR. HOLSTON: Second. 47 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Seconded by Ed. 48 The proposal is on the table for discussion and 49 50

```
Page 211
     consideration.
 2
                     MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.
 3
 4
 5
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.
 6
 7
                     MS. CAMINER: I have a question for the
 8
     Council.
 9
                     Do any of you use other than
10
     biodegradable kind of bait and what's your experience
11
     been. Or have any of you used some of this artificial
12
13
     lures or scents.
14
15
                                          Go ahead, Andy.
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
16
                     MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah.
17
                                             Yeah.
                                                    Through
18
     the Chair. Thank you.
19
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Uh-huh.
20
21
2.2
                     MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. I -- this would
23
     be a proposal that I, myself, would write. You know,
     I'm a bear baiter. I've been holding off because our
24
25
     bear population went to lower levels, so I haven't been
     doing it for a couple of years now. But I have to
26
     change -- if I haven't gotten my bear with the State
27
     stuff when I have used dog food, okay, I have to change
28
     and not use it if I was to continue on into June, as
29
30
     the Federal subsistence users are allowed to use it.
31
                     So in my opinion, food is food.
32
     not buying the habituating them through it. A bear
33
34
     goes through the woods. He smells food. If it's human
35
     food or natural food or whatever or industrial
     processed, food is food. They just identify with
36
     calories, you know.
37
38
39
                     So I know that I'm going to support
     this.
40
41
                     That's for sure. Yeah.
42
43
44
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                           Thank you, Andy.
45
                     Do you have a question? Go ahead, Ed.
46
47
48
                     MR. HOLSTON: Yeah.
                                          Through the Chair.
     Just from the Cooper Landing area we have -- I know of
49
50
```

a number of bear baiting stations in the Cooper Landing area, but I'm not aware of any problems that have resulted from bear baiting stations. In other words, bears moving into the local community and creating problems that way.

So I'm in support of this.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Ed.

Go ahead, Ricky.

MR. GEASE: In response to Judy's question, yes. I've used -- hunted on bear baiting stations on the Kenai Peninsula. Yes. We have used dog food and, you know, used, you know, molasses as a scent. And I think the definition of scent is good, you know, and I have -- I question -- in our area, in the City of Kenai, yes, we've had -- you know, I have a trash container that's bear proof. We've done a lot of education on bear proofing communities.

I think it's a separate issue with bear baiting stations.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.

Well, I'll give you a couple of information here.

Go ahead, Daniel.

MR. STEVENS: You know, I don't do any bear baiting, but when I was growing up I used to see them all over in my village -- or not in my village. Because I don't recall Chitina ever bear baiting. But I've seen up in Copper Center and Tazlina they had them like 20 feet away from their house and never worried about the bears attacking their houses and stuff by being food -- human food conditioned. I don't think we've ever had a problem at bear baitings in our area for whatever they use. But I don't see how it could be a -- bear conditioning be a problem.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. I would just make a comment. I do know that in the Ninilchik area -- and of course this is State land -- we do have a few people that bear bait and we do allow bear baiting on some of the Native land and they do some

hunting there for personal use and for baiting. And actually it's controlled quite well. And I'll be honest. I think it's actually helping the moose population. It's kept it down. It's out in kind of a -- you know, a far out area. And I think it's kind of helped the community in some. We have several registered there.

And I will speak a little bit to law enforcement. I don't know how -- you know, we talk about that a little bit, but I do know that, you know, if they're monitored right and they're controlled that it doesn't seem to be a problem.

21 22

We had one local trooper. I'm not going to give his name. But I seen him out at the road -- on the Oil Well Road one day and he's walking down the road and I come around the corner and I could see him going -- sniff -- in the air like this. And I'm going what the hell is going on. He had a report of someone putting out bait and was sniffing. Too close to the road and he was looking for them to bust them. They actually got them up on the highway system.

But, you know, I don't know. The bears -- I believe that you could take a bear without bait. But I support the bear baiting, too, so whatever.

Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Well, I guess I was just interested if anybody had used the biodegradable scent product at all. I mean I know people do bear bait and that's certainly allowed. And this is just asking for that one part of the change, so I just wondered if people had experience with that.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Are donuts biodegradable.

(Laughter)

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I've used what they call the scent ball. It's essentially like a large piece of hard candy. But a bear on a bait will destroy that in one, you know. And so you can -- you know, I cook these up and use them. You know, and you lift it up into a tree so it can't be reached, you know, between two.

```
Page 214
                     But at the end of season, the way the
     laws are, you have to remove all. I mean you can't
 2
     have any scent. Even infected dirt. Everything has to
 3
     go from that area when season's over, you know. And I
 4
     can say they smell it from downwind and come.
 5
 6
 7
                     And I believe it gives you a selection
     of which, you know. If oh, that bear's a little too
 8
     small, you know. Oh, that's a sow. You can pick a
 9
     boar. You know, if you're a good hunter, this gives
10
11
     you an opportunity to be very selective about what
     you're going to do and the scent certainly works.
12
13
14
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any other
15
     comments.
16
                     Go ahead, Tom.
17
18
                     MR. EVANS: Just a quick clarification.
19
     Andy was asking about the distance and under the
20
     Federal regulations it's a mile from any place -- any
21
2.2.
     inhabitable place. So.....
23
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: It's hard to find
24
25
     anymore.
26
                     (Laughter)
27
28
29
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. We have a
30
     motion. We have a second. Did we call the question.
31
                     UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Call the question.
32
33
34
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Question's been
35
     called for. All in favor of the proposal, aye.
36
37
                     IN UNISON: Aye.
38
39
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any opposed.
40
41
                     (No opposing votes)
42
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: So carries.
43
44
     Thank you.
45
                     Go ahead, Donald.
46
47
48
                     MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair, I was requested
     that we take a short break and get our technical.....
49
50
```

```
Page 215
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                           Technical
 2
     difficulties, Nate, doesn't have any do you?
 3
 4
                     REPORTER: (Shakes head negatively)
 5
                     MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair, the screen --
 6
 7
     screen situated. So if we take a short break, we'll be
 8
     good to go.
 9
10
                     Thank you, Mr. Chair.
11
12
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Get some
13
     coffee, take a short break, and we'll.....
14
15
                     MR. EVANS: Could I ask a quick
     question before you guys so.
16
17
18
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                           Sure, Tom.
19
                     MR. EVANS: Was that approved, as
20
21
     modified by OSM, or.....
2.2
23
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                          Yes.
24
25
                     MR. EVANS: Yes. Okay. Okay. Okay.
26
                     (Off record)
27
28
29
                     (On record)
30
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: We're going to
31
     move on to our presentations. Okay. We're back and
32
     we're going to start with our Fish Resource Monitoring
33
34
     Program. And I think Robbin's going to go ahead and
35
     take us through that.
36
37
                     We'll get out of the way here and go
38
     back where we can see.
39
40
                     MS. LA VINE:
                                  All right. Good morning,
     Mr. Chair and Members of the Council. My name is
41
     Robbin La Vine and I'm an anthropologist for the
42
     Southcentral Region of Alaska. And Scott Ayers is my
43
     fisheries associate also for the Southcentral Region of
44
     Alaska.
45
46
                     And today we will be presenting you
47
     with a brief overview of the Fisheries Resource
48
     Monitoring Program and its accomplishments to date.
49
50
```

I'll review the funding process, your regional overview, and finish up by requesting your comments on the proposed 2018 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program for the Southcentral and multi-regions. No motion is necessary.

The Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program materials starts on page 214 of your Council books. In addition, I will be passing out an information packet for the multi-region overview.

And it's over there at the table.

All right.

21 22

The Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program is a multi-disciplinary, collaborative effort that enhances subsistence fisheries research and provides necessary information for the management of subsistence fisheries on Federal public lands in Alaska. We encourage partnerships between Tribes, rural organizations, universities, and Federal and State agencies. In addition, we encourage interdisciplinary approaches to conducting research and addressing issues.

The Monitoring Program is administered through the Office of Subsistence Management in order to advance projects of strategic importance to the Federal Subsistence Management Program. It also coordinates communications and information sharing of ongoing and new subsistence research efforts. Since its inception in 2000 the Monitoring Program has funded 452 projects statewide with the total allocation of close to \$117 million.

The figures on this slide demonstrate both the allocation of funds and the number of projects funded through the Monitoring Program by the organization of the principle investigator. And it should be noted that some of these funds have been used by principle investigators to subcontract with research partners, such as communities, Tribes, and other research organizations.

This slide demonstrates the allocation of funds by region. Budget guidelines provide an initial target for planning; however, they are not final and are often adjusted as needed to ensure that

we fund quality projects.

 I'll now review with you five steps to the FRMP funding process that spans a two-year cycle. So the State is divided into six regions that approximately correspond to Federal subsistence fisheries areas and to stock, harvest, and community issues that those areas hold in common.

Step 1. For each of the six regions, Office of Subsistence Management staff works with Regional Advisory Councils and Federal and State fishery and land managers to ensure the monitoring program focuses on the highest priority subsistence fishery information needs. Input and guidance from Councils are used to develop priority information needs by identifying issues of local concern and knowledge gaps related to subsistence fisheries.

Ideally, principle investigators will work closely with Councils in order to develop strong proposals that are responsive to those needs. The Office of Subsistence Management provides technical assistance as needed.

Step 2. The program requests new projects every two years. Submissions must be complete, on time, and address five criteria outlined in the notice of funding opportunity in order to be competitive. Those criteria are strategic priority, technical scientific merit, investigator ability and resources, partnership and capacity building, and the cost benefit of the project. A more detailed description of the five criteria can be found on page 219 of your Council books.

Step 3. Once submitted, a technical review committee evaluates and rates each proposed project. The technical review committee is a standing interagency committee of senior technical experts brought together to ensure program transparency. It is the responsibility of the technical review committee to develop the strongest possible monitoring program for your region and across the State based on high quality, cost effective projects that address critical subsistence questions.

During the proposal evaluation process the technical review committee adheres to specific

guidelines in order to assess how well a project addressed the five criteria. While some agencies may have more than one senior expert on the committee, like a social scientist or a fisheries biologist, each agency only provides one, single consolidated review and will not score their own proposals. The final score for each proposal is based on an assessment of the five criteria.

Step 4. Once a draft monitoring plan is developed it is brought before the Regional Advisory Councils for their input and comments. And this is where we are today. This is where are in our two-year cycle and we'll get back to this step in a moment.

2.2

Additional comments on the process in draft 2018 fisheries monitoring plan in the Southcentral Alaska and multi-regions are provided by the interagency staff committee. And these along with those comments developed by the councils are then forwarded to the Federal Subsistence Board. The Board takes into consideration comments and concerns generated by the process and endorses the funding plan. Final approval of the funding plan is made by the assistant regional director of OSM.

So in your region, Southcentral of Alaska, 49 projects have been undertaken since 2000 for approximately \$14.1 million in funding. Project leads were predominantly held by the Department of Agriculture, State of Alaska or the Alaska rural organizations. You can find a list of those 49 projects on page 231 of your Council books.

 Okay. For 2018, the Department of the Interior, through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, will provide an anticipated one to one and a half million in funding for new projects and up to 1.6 million for ongoing projects that were initially funded in 2016. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, through the U.S. Forest Service, has historically provided 1.8 million annually.

The Department of Agriculture funding available for 2018 projects in uncertain. Please note that the available funding for 2018 is budgeted for each project's first year and not the total project request. For the Southcentral Alaska region, seven projects were submitted. The projects are listed in

order by the strength of their technical review committee scores. Justification for project order begin on page 225 of your Council books and project abstracts begin on page 233.

You may want to note that these projects were submitted in response to the priority information needs that we reviewed with you last fall. And those can be found on page 223 of your Council books.

In the multi-region category 16 projects have been undertaken for approximately two and a half million in funding over the course of this program. Project leads were predominantly held by the State of Alaska. And you can refer to your handout for more information on the multi-region.

For the multi-region category, two projects were submitted. The projects are listed in order by the strength of their technical review committee scores. Justifications for project order began on page four of the handout and project abstracts can be found on page seven.

So once again we are here at step 4 of the FRMP funding process. We are looking for your input and comments on the draft monitoring plan for your region. No motion is necessary, but there are some points for you to consider when reviewing the seven projects submitted to your region or the two submitted for the multi-region categories. And that might be project alignment with the priority information needs that you reviewed last fall, proposal score order, proposal abstracts. You can also comment on the overall process.

Thank you, Chair and Council.

I'm ready for your comments.

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$  SELANOFF: With these projects, where could I find a summation or the actions on these for the projects.

 $$\operatorname{MS}.$  LA VINE: Through the Chair. Which page are you on?

MS. SELANOFF: I'm on page 232. So

```
Page 220
     it's 231 and 232. Where can I find the projects and
     what they all involved?
 2
 3
 4
                     MS. LA VINE:
                                   Thank you. Through the
     Chair. If you look at the projects funded for the
 5
     Southcentral Region and -- and they -- all those listed
 6
     begin on page 231. The first thing you can do to kind
 7
     of walk your way through it is figure out the numbering
 8
     -- how we number.
 9
10
11
                     So when you see 00-013, that 00
     indicates the year 2000.
12
13
                     MS. SELANOFF: Okay.
14
                                           Okay.
15
16
                     MS. LA VINE: So any projects from 00
17
     were begun....
18
19
                     MS. SELANOFF:
                                    Okay.
20
                     MS. LA VINE: .....in the year 2000.
21
2.2
     01 begun in the year 2001, et cetera.
23
                     MS. SELANOFF: Okay.
24
25
                     MS. LA VINE: Pretty much all of these
26
     -- until you get to any that start with 16, pretty much
27
     all of those have been wrapped up and completed over
28
     the course of the program. And those reports -- those
29
     final reports and the results of these efforts we have
30
     available at the Office of Subsistence Management.
31
32
33
                     And you can contact either Scott or I
34
     and we will ensure that you have a copy of these
35
     reports.
36
37
                     MS. SELANOFF: Are they online anywhere
38
     where I can just go look them up?
39
40
                     MS. LA VINE:
                                  They are in most cases
41
     not online.
                  Some of them if they are an Alaska
     Department of Fish and Game technical paper, then they
42
     will have them listed online. You can also order them
43
     through the library system. They are available through
44
     ARLIS. But we can send you a digital copy -- a PDF
45
     copy of the report as well, if you would like to
46
     receive them digitally and not in hard copy.
47
48
                     Thank you.
49
50
```

Page 221 MS. SELANOFF: Thank you. 1 2 3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. 4 5 Judy. 6 7 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, thank you. A few questions again for our newer members. On page 223 8 is a list of the priority information needs that the 9 10 Council identified last year and in previous years, I 11 guess, too. So I guess do you know a reason why there may not be, you know, Kenai or Kasilof proposals that 12 were included in -- submitted by researchers? 13 14 15 MS. LA VINE: Thank you. Through the Chair. The seven projects that you see listed for this 16 year are all the projects that were submitted. And so 17 when I discuss or say that, you know, through the 18 course of the two-year cycle that principle 19 investigators could be working with the Council to 20 develop strong proposals in response to the priority 21 2.2 information needs, that could have been happening, could be happening, but no one submitted a proposal to 23 response to those priority information needs. 24 25 26 Thank you. 27 28 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Ricky, go ahead. 29 30 MR. GEASE: Well, it's just interesting because the Alaska Board of Fisheries indicated to the 31 Alaska Department of Fish and Game that priority --32 king salmon information on the Kasilof was a high 33 34 priority for that. That there was a gap of information 35 on kings on the Kasilof. 36 37 They've spent the last six years doing I think a really great job of showing out the accuracy 38 and precision of the king salmon monitoring on the 39 Kenai River, but it's just interesting that both this 40 RAC and the Board of Fisheries indicated that king 41 salmon issues on the Kasilof were a high priority and 42 nothing was submitted. 43 44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Robbin. 45 46 MS. LA VINE: Thank you. 47 Through the 48 Chair. As we go through this two-year process -- and we may be developing -- begin to develop the next 49

funding cycle's priority information needs probably in the spring and then finalizing them by next fall, a year from -- you know, this fall. You have the opportunity to keep track of those issues of most importance in your region, any information gaps that really move forward, and you can begin -- we can begin to document those issues and priority information needs of most interest to the Council.

So here now is -- we can start documenting your -- those needs.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well, you could document that one. That gap on the Kasilof and track it.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Diane.

21 22

 MS. SELANOFF: Can we -- is it possible for us to get a list of all of the ones that were considered and then the ones that were prioritized and why? So just to have kind of an idea of what was -- you know, what was all presented and why they weren't -- why they didn't make the final cut, I suppose.

MS. LA VINE: Thank you. Through the Chair. These are all of the proposals that were submitted. So we've not cut away any. The list that you find -- the seven proposals for your consideration are all the proposals that were submitted for this cycle.

 Right now what we're looking for is your comments on those seven proposals, those seven projects. Which ones you think really address the priority information needs that were developed a year ago or reviewed a year ago. And again remembering that this year the funds on hand for the entire State are 1 to \$1.6 million divided up among the first year budgets of each project.

So not all of -- you know, not all the projects are going to get funded. We're going to be looking at a small amount. When you look at your seven projects, definitely they're not all going to fly.

MS. SELANOFF: Okay. All right.

Page 223 Thanks for the education on that 2 process. 3 4 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Judy. 5 MS. CAMINER: Well, I'll ask something 6 7 I know you're probably not able to answer. can give us some hints though. 8 9 10 As you recall, two years ago we went 11 through a lengthy process of evaluating proposals and none of them were funded. So -- and we could tell some 12 of that ahead of time, I suppose, by reading through 13 the lines. 14 15 I mean in this case, maybe aside from 16 the proposal that scored number one, every other one 17 has some sort of negative comment in there. 18 Is that an indicator of how cuts may be made later on or do you 19 anticipate any funding for Southcentral projects? 20 21 2.2 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That's a good 23 question. 24 25 Go ahead, Robbin. 26 Thank you. Through the 27 MS. LA VINE: Chair. It really -- we generally target -- a certain 28 amount we try to hold in reserve for each region to 29 make sure that funding are properly distributed and 30 that all of the priority information needs statewide --31 some of the most critical are addressed. It doesn't 32 mean that we will be funding projects that are not 33 34 competitive in regards to all of the merits, all of the 35 criteria that we look at. 36 That being said, there are some really 37 strong projects for Southcentral Region and it's -- we 38 are again looking for your comments. When we -- when 39 the final plan moves before the Board, Council comments 40 41 can really help. 42 43 Thank you. 44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Rick. 45 You get to make a list of comments. 46 47 48 Thank you. 49 50

Page 224 MR. GEASE: So on looking at the first project, which was the highest scored project, 2 estimating in-river abundance of Copper River chinook 3 4 salmon, was the Native Village of Eyak able to find matching money of the \$200,000 that is currently 5 unfunded? 6 7 8 MR. AYERS: Through the Chair. I was just speaking with Mr. Piche, who's 9 Gease, yeah. 10 here representing NVE's program for this project, and I 11 believe that he's got more to provide to us on that front. But it sounds as though things are promising at 12 this point in time. 13 14 15 I'll let him give the additional information. 16 17 18 MR. GEASE: Okay. 19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Do you want to 20 21 come up and give a..... 2.2. 23 MR. PICHE: For the record, my name is Matt Piche. 24 I am the natural resources coordinator and 25 fish biologist for the Native Village of Eyak. 26 And Through the Chair, Council Member 27 Gease, yes, we received -- we just received 28 notification that we obtained Alaska sustainable 29 funding which will cover the remaining portion of the 30 budget if we are successful in obtaining FRMP funds. 31 32 33 Thank you. 34 35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Very good. 36 37 MR. GEASE: So is that four years worth 38 of funding? Because this seems to be a four-year 39 project. 40 41 MR. PICHE: The Alaska sustainable salmon fund will cover three years of funding, so that 42 fourth year we will still have a portion of the budget 43 that's unfunded. 44 45 Thank you, Matt. 46 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: 47 48 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. 49 50

Page 225 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Judy. 1 2 MS. CAMINER: Well, certainly the first 3 4 five -- you know, they are continuing projects. We're real familiar with them. I think we're -- we've been 5 pretty happy with the work that's been done and the 6 7 information provided. 8 9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Uh-huh. That's 10 good feedback to note. 11 12 Any other comments or..... 13 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question. 14 15 16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Gloria. 17 18 MS. STICKWAN: So these six are going to be funded? Seven? I don't understand. 19 confused, I guess. Which ones are going to be funded? 20 I see amounts beside them, which made me think that 21 2.2 they're going to be funded. 23 MS. LA VINE: Thank you. Through the 24 25 Chair. So what we're looking at first. If you look -these projects are listed in the order of their scores 26 through the technical review committee. No projects 27 have been funded statewide yet. We're in the process 28 of considering them. And the first step in the process 29 was to have them go through the technical review 30 committee that then looking at the five criteria, the 31 score order that you see to the left is how they are 32 going to be moved forward to the Board. There are --33 34 again, there are no other projects listed for the 35 Southcentral Region. 36 37 If you look at the columns, on the righthand side of this table, you see the total project 38 39 request. 40 41 MS. STICKWAN: 224? 42 MS. LA VINE: 43 Hmm? 44 45 MS. STICKWAN: You're on page 224? 46 MS. LA VINE: 224. So if you --47 Yes. there's two columns. Total project request and the 48 annual average request. What we're really interested 49 50

in for the moment is the average annual request. That's basically the -- kind of a target for first year funding for each project. And this is not a guarantee. This is just the -- it's good to take that column into consideration when we look at what projects are going to be funded and how we are going to divvy up the one to one and a half million dollars statewide for all the projects submitted. And once again, we're here for your comments and -- on that process.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Comments are lack of funding, but go ahead, Ricky. And then we'll go to.....

Go ahead, Andy, then.

21 22

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Thank you. Through the Chair. Just curious of this -- the committee that reviews these and scores them or whatnot. So could you expand on why like something it seems like smaller, like Ibeck Creek or Long Lake -- very refined and in a very specific location to a smaller fishery would get a higher score than something like the Upper Copper River that's more of a bird's eye view. Hey, this would give us -- if our funding is limited, it seems like the more scoring or focus should go towards something that's a larger region, wide coverage than something small.

MS. LA VINE: Thank you. Through the Chair. When we come up with -- the five criteria cannot be morphed, changed, moved depending on funding, et cetera. We're looking at -- we're looking at the technical and scientific merit on page 219. So if you look at 219.

 And how this works is each of those five criteria are weighted basically equally. And so you can look at a small project with -- you know, in a small target area, but if it beautifully addresses a priority information need, if it has strong capacity building and partnerships written in, if it has got a really cost effective budget and its technical and scientific merit, you know, and its investigator capacity is really strong, it's going to fly as opposed to let's say -- yeah, the -- you know, a -- hmm -- a project that addresses a really critical information

Page 227 need, but potentially may not have any partnerships involved, potentially does not use -- has not utilized 2 a budget effectively or funds effectively. We're 3 looking at so many different things when this order --4 this score order is generated. 5 6 7 Thank you. 8 9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Before Rick goes, 10 well, our priorities are a little more simple. But 11 anyway, that's a..... 12 (Laughter) 13 14 15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: We look at the 16 uses. 17 18 Go ahead, Rick. 19 MR. GEASE: I'd like to just put on the 20 record just a comment. Thanks to the other members, 21 Gloria and Judy, for participating in the fisheries --2.2. 23 what we've done as a subcommittee on this. 24 25 I think it's been very helpful. 26 I'd like to say congratulations to 27 Native Village of Eyak on going out and finding the 28 matching funds. That was a big, big step for them to 29 30 find the matching funds. It's gratifying to hear that they were successful going out and finding that 31 funding. 32 33 34 In years past for Council members, the 35 whole project was funded through this, so 400,000. So it's quite an accomplishment to find matching 50 36 percent funding on that. And congratulations to them. 37 38 39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Very good. 40 41 Any other feedback, comments. 42 Gloria, go ahead. 43 44 MS. STICKWAN: I just want to say that 45 abundance and timing of -- what is it -- run timing of 46 salmon in Tanada Creek. That's the first salmon that 47 goes up the Copper River. And Katie John started 48 because of this, because she wasn't getting fish up 49 50

there. That tells us how many fish are mating, spawning grounds or early run during May. I don't know why it scored so low. It's been a longtime successful project.

The one for the -- to get information between sonar count in Glennallen. I mean there's no way to tell how many fish are being harvested. There's no sonar. It just tells how many fish are going up the river, but you don't know how many fish are being harvested, how many reach the spawning grounds other than the few streams they study.

So I don't know why these are so low.

I mean I just -- I disagree with the way this was -- and whose local concern is this. Is this just Fish and Game's local concern. Is it -- what do you mean by local concern. You say criteria is a local concern. Whose local concern is that. Are you guys just taking Fish and Game's local concern or -- you say the criteria 219 is local concern. Because it has been a local concern for us for years and years and we stated that for years.

That inadequate data is being -- not getting between -- for our area. We don't -- we believe fish are being over harvested and it's not being -- other than there's yearly reports that people probably don't fill out right every day that they catch them, which are probably inaccurate.

Somebody needs to be monitoring these.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Do you want to make a comment there, Daniel, first?

MR. STEVENS: Yeah. I'd like to ask a question. On 219 you've got these criterias. Are they in order of what's -- as in Federal jurisdiction is number one. Number two, are they in priority order? Priority list, if you understand what I mean?

MS. LA VINE: Yes. Thank you. Through the Chair. No. They're not in any particular priority. As far as -- so if anyone wants to look at what we're talking about, it's on page 219 of our Council books.

21 22

MR. STEVENS: Right.

MS. LA VINE: And under one of the five criteria, the first called strategic priorities. And these are the topics that help us qualify for the rating process. What a strategic priority may address. It doesn't mean local concern being the last on the bullet list. It doesn't mean that that is of least concern.

Demonstrating local, Federally qualified subsistence user interest in a particular issue is critical to the priority information need development process. It often becomes — these are — the priority information needs are developed and approved and finalized through the Council and we look to you for your local knowledge and expertise on what is important to our stakeholders in your area.

So it starts with you.

And then to respond to Gloria in regards to low ratings versus high ratings, this list of seven projects may not necessarily -- it may not necessarily indicate a low rating. It just means that some projects in regards to how they were reviewed are going to just edge out some of the others. It doesn't mean it was rated low just because it's number five on this list.

And having you forward your comments and your concern about Tanada Creek and the run timing of salmon on Tanada Creek, it's important to develop a record of that and it's important to forward those comments to the Board.

MS. STICKWAN: I just think we need inseason data gathering as well because we have no idea how many salmon are -- other than Tanada Creek how many are being harvested. And there's just no in-season management for the Copper River.

That's a concern.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Yeah, there's a lot of concern here. I would ask the Council, do we agree with the score order on page 224.

MS. STICKWAN: I just did.

```
Page 230
                     Yeah.
                            I got your feedback. Good.
                                                         And
     I highlighted it. See this big, red thing right there?
 2
 3
 4
                     MS. CAMINER: Dan has something.
 5
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
 6
                                           Dan.
 7
 8
                     MR. STEVENS: There's one creek.
 9
     Ibeck Creek.
                   I don't really realize where that would
10
     be located.
11
12
                     UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible -
13
     away from mic)
14
15
                     MR. STEVENS:
                                   Okay. Yeah.
                                                  I disagree
     with your list of priorities. I believe that -- I
16
     agree with Gloria that we should be looking at the
17
     upper river fisheries first because they are our first
18
     fish to come up. So they go all the way up.
19
20
                     And then when you've got Long Lake --
21
2.2
     Long Lake is before the upper river fisheries and there
     really isn't any fish coming out of -- being fished out
23
     of the Long Lake run, except for where the charters
24
25
     are. Because everything cuts off at the Chitina River
     and it goes up -- they go up the Chitina River.
26
27
28
                     So they're not even part of our
29
     fisheries basically. A part.
                                    They're got some part in
30
     the charters, but not where we use for subsistence.
31
32
                     Thank you.
33
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Good feedback.
34
35
     Good, good feedback.
36
37
                     Any more.
38
39
                     Ricky, go ahead.
40
41
                     MR. GEASE: On your second one, the
     last sentence on the Gulkana River sockeye salmon
42
     harvest contribution.
43
44
45
                     MS. LA VINE:
                                   What page.
46
47
                     MR. GEASE: Page 227.
                                            The top, last
                It says the investigator is encouraged to
48
     further develop how this project will help subsistence
49
50
```

management. Was that ever fleshed out or is this just a project that is an important information need that is tangential to subsistence management? Because we are talking about subsistence management here, so it -- curious.

MR. GEASE: Thank you, Mr. Gease. Through the Chair. The justifications for the project scoring are meant to help the principle investigators as they develop competitive proposals. So sometimes it may be very obvious and very apparent how a project -- how important a project is to priority information needs in an area or to fisheries managers and management, but they don't address it in the proposal.

And say for example something devastating happened and we had a number of new senior experts at the technical review committee. Very unlikely, but regardless we want folks to be able to clearly explain how their project may serve fisheries management.

We've had projects who we know the principle investigators -- we may know that they work closely with local communities and they have partnerships and yet nothing in their proposal reflects that. We tell them to demonstrate clearly for us that they are actually addressing some of these five criteria.

And it can't be simply known to the reviewers if it's not fully explained in a proposal.

Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, Robbin, it sounds to me like you've gotten some pretty good feedback from the Council, so maybe we could -- that would help. We definitely hear more of a cry for -- just a minute. We've got here a cry for the Kenai in the Kasilof area. You've had some very good feedback here and I would like to move on.

So I'm not sure short of a longer workshop, but the Council's wishes to write comments. And Gloria, you have comments -- a lot of good comments here, so -- Dan gave you some very good stuff that -- how we should look at the river.

Page 232 So what else. Would you like to make 2 another comment, Andy? Go ahead. 3 4 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just real quick here. Just kind of an ending 5 comment. 6 7 The testing of the unmanned aircraft 8 system seems like very valid. I would bump that up if 9 there was a possibility to do that. It's far reaching. 10 11 Say even -- you know, if they're focusing on one drainage, right. They're going to do like a little 12 pilot project for this one and just try to figure that 13 14 out, it would help like Y-K on some drainage or 15 something. 16 It's a far reaching, big scope of 17 benefit from learning a new methodology that's just --18 19 it seems like that's really important in the scheme of 20 salmon returns statewide. Yeah. 21 2.2 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. 23 Go ahead, Dan. 24 25 26 MS. STICKWAN: Okay. 27 28 MR. STEVENS: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead. 29 MS. STICKWAN: Because you're looking 30 for how -- personally, me. My thought would be number 31 one. Because it's being supported by Eyak. Number 32 five and number six would -- in that order would be my 33 34 priorities. And then the rest however. 35 So if you're looking for feedback on 36 37 these, that's mine. 38 And I would like to contribute more 39 because we have fisheries in Port Graham and Nanwalek 40 41 that are in desperate need of assistance, too. So I would like to meet with you further about how we can 42 get some projects going in that area. 43 44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Very good. 45 You've got a good start here. 46 47 48 Thank you, guys. 49 50

```
Page 233
                     MS. STICKWAN:
                                    I have a question.
 2
 3
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Gloria, go ahead.
 4
 5
                     MS. STICKWAN: Are you going to
     continue that work group for in the future?
 6
 7
 8
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Judy had a
 9
     question. Go ahead and ask that.
10
11
                     MS. CAMINER: Do you want comments on
12
     this multi-regional overview? Is that why you gave it
     to us also?
13
14
15
                     MS. LA VINE:
                                   Thank you.
                                               Through the
                   If you have any comments on the two
16
     Chair. Yes.
     projects that are encompassed by the multi-region, we
17
     can take those comments as well.
18
19
                     Thank you.
20
21
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.
2.2
23
                     MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. Well, my
24
25
     question would be have we -- has the Fisheries Resource
     Management Program ever funded OSM before to do
26
     projects?
27
28
29
                     MS. LA VINE:
                                   Thank you.
                                               Through the
30
     Chair. No, I don't believe so.
                                      Thank you.
31
                     MS. CAMINER: I'm not sure I would
32
     support that part of it just being a Federal agency.
33
34
35
                     Thank you.
36
37
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                           Okay.
                                                  Thank you,
     Robbin.
              We'll go on. And we -- hopefully, we covered
38
39
     that.
40
41
                     Okay.
42
                     MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair.
43
44
45
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Donald.
46
47
                     MR. MIKE: Yeah.
                                       Earlier I --
     yesterday I spoke at the Native Village of Eyak.
48
     would like to present its partners information program
49
50
```

to this Council after the FRMP, if Mr. Piche is ready.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. PICHE: Hello. My name is Matt Piche. I am the partners program fish biologist and natural resources coordinator for the Native Village of Eyak in Cordova.

To give a brief background on the history of king salmon monitoring on the Copper River for new Council members, since 2003 the Native Village of Eyak has been responsible for estimating in river abundance of Copper River king salmon. This project uses well established and independently verified two sample mark/recapture techniques and statistical analysis to determine the number of king salmon passing through Baird Canyon, utilizing research style fishwheels to capture, tag, and release king salmon.

Prior to 2003, ADF&G used similar mark or capture techniques, but used boat based dipnetting for the first sample event and the Chitina dipnet fishery for the recovery event to estimate abundance from 1999 to 2003. Prior to 1999, aerial escapement indices over clear water tributaries and catch age modeling were used to estimate escapement indices over clear water tribs. This method has since been deemed inaccurate following radiotelemetry studies determining that index streams represented only a small portion of the overall king salmon abundance. Therefore, no system-wide escapement data exists on the Copper River prior to 1999.

The only data we have prior to 1999 in king salmon are harvest estimates.

The two sample mark/recapture method is a widely accepted technique used for estimating population sizes when absolute counts are impractical. Due to the nature of the Copper River, mark/recapture techniques are the most accurate currently available method for assessing system-wide king salmon abundance.

So for our 2017 results, from May 15th through July 11th 3,819 king salmon received a primary and a secondary mark at Baird Canyon and 1,645 were examined for marks at our Canyon Creek camp. Of the 1,645 examined, 180 king salmon were marked. Based on

these results, the 2017 in-river abundance estimate of Copper River king salmon is 40,725, with a standard error of 4,187, a lower confidence interval of 32,520, and an upper confidence interval of 48,931.

This represents chinook salmon migrating through Baird Canyon through May 15th to July 11th that measure 448 millimeters mid-eye to fork length or greater. This is an abundance estimate only and not an absolute count, meaning the value was calculated using statistics and a durak estimator.

Based on the confidence interval, it can be stated that we are 95 percent confident that the true population value lies between 32,520 and 48,931 king salmon. And again the in-river abundance estimate is 40,725 with a standard error of 4,187.

 Overall, that's a very strong run compared to last year.

NVE reports the in-river abundance estimate and its associated error every year to all Copper River fishery managers, the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council, and OSM. From this in-river abundance estimate, Federal and State harvest is subtracted. Federal and State in-river harvest is subtracted by ADF&G to publish a system-wide escapement estimate. Conversely, ocean flats harvest is added to the in-river abundance estimate by ADF&G to publish the annual total run size estimate.

Thus far, NVE's mark/recapture program has exceeded established precision goals every year.

There has been an awful lot of concern regarding the accuracy of ADF&G's preseason forecast, so I just wanted to remind the Council that the Copper River king salmon data set is still in its infancy, with only 15 years of in-river abundance using concurrent methods. This is a relatively small database compared to 40-plus years of Copper River sockeye abundance or 32 years of Kenai king salmon abundance, so -- and also during this time the range of escapement has been relatively small.

So due to the narrow range of escapement during this relatively short period of data collection, the forecast predictions and models drawn

from this data are limited in their accuracy. These factors contribute to the variance and forecast estimates, as does the error associated with the abundance estimate and harvest estimates.

I also wanted to update the Council that in an effort to better understand and potentially improve upon the ADF&G preseason forecasting methods for Copper River king salmon, NVE contracted a third-party fisheries biometrician from LGL to conduct an independent analysis of the modeling methods used for the 2017 forecast. This independent analysis has been completed and has since been shared with the Copper River commercial fisheries division managers.

This type of open data sharing and independent analysis is a critical part of scientific advancement.

21 22

For example, in the past NVE has conducted a study to independently validate the Miles Lake sockeye sonar counts after they were switched to DIDSON. And conversely ADF&G independently had validated many of NVE's mark recapture study assumptions. NVE participates in and encourages this type of critical analysis and we are hopeful that NVE and ADF&G can continue to assist one another with the goal of improving our knowledge of Copper River salmon towards a common goal of sustainable fisheries for all user groups.

And lastly, to update and inform the Council on where things are headed for Copper River king salmon management, salmon species ID using sonar is being investigated on the Copper River by both NVE and ADF&G. NVE began working towards this transition several years ago and database sharing between the two organizations is taking place.

In 2017, ADF&G borrowed two ARIS 1800 units and began familiarizing themselves with the new systems at Miles Lake. NVE has also purchased one ARIS model 1800 sonar to develop both a length frequency analysis and a large fish species ID. These processes will utilize biometrics of sockeye and king salmon obtained using ARIS sonar and actual measurements of the imaged fish on our fishwheel platforms beginning in 2018. This biometric data combined with sonar data and genetics data will provide insight on differences

between the multiple Copper River king salmon stocks, thus measuring variation in biometric and sonar based stock specific length.

We will also be testing the read range efficiencies of ARIS within the Copper River waters to determine the appropriate maximum distances for length based identification. NVE's sonar data paired with ADF&G Miles Lake data may provide the opportunity for a switch to sonar estimates hopefully within the next four years.

If and when king salmon sonar counts are developed on the Copper, it should known that this value will be an estimate only and not an absolute passage value due to the counting methodology and the fact that full coverage of the channel is impossible at the Miles Lake site. While NVE and ADF&G are very helpful, the ARIS sonar is the future of Copper River king salmon management.

It should be noted that the Copper River presents major obstacles that are not present on any other Alaskan stream where this technology is currently being used.

Specifically, increased resolution results in decreased read range; therefore, the ARIS cannot provide the same channel coverage when compared to the lower resolution DIDSON that's currently being used. The decreased read range combined with the tendency for king salmon to travel further offshore at the Miles Lake site compared to sockeye salmon may result in a delay in implementation until read ranges can either be improved on the ARIS units or until additional offshore ARIS units can be safely deployed.

However, deploying an ARIS offshore at the Miles Lake site is inherently difficult due to the glacial influence, the location of Miles Lake, above the lake a lot of glacial debris and vehicle to house sized icebergs present at the site and distributed throughout the full channel width. Yet options should exist to make this work and we're hopeful that these obstacles can be overcome, but this will be a challenging task and development of a sonar system will need to be conducted alongside the mark or capture program until bank coverage in proportion of the population within sonar range can be accurately

Page 238 determined and estimates can be independently verified. 2 We're all very excited about the 3 4 opportunity for this transition, but it's probably going to take a while before we can figure this out. 5 The Copper River is a very difficult place to implement 6 this technology. 7 8 9 So thank you. 10 11 And if anyone has any questions I'll be 12 happy to answer them. 13 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: 14 That was a very, 15 very good presentation. So if you run out of work and you want to come to the Kenai, let us know. Okay? 16 17 18 (Laughter) 19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Ricky, go ahead. 20 21 2.2 MR. GEASE: You said -- you made 23 mention of an LGL independent evaluation. Can you explain what information was shared with Fish and Game 24 25 on that? 26 MR. PICHE: Out of courtesy and the 27 agreement between us and Fish and Game, we're just 28 giving that information to them at this point until 29 30 they have conducted a full review of it. So we're just kind of keeping it between us. It wasn't paid for with 31 Federal funds or grant funds or anything like that, so 32 we're just..... 33 34 35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Top secret. 36 37 MR. PICHE: For now. But at the winter 38 meeting I'm sure they have their review done by then. 39 40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Gloria. 41 MS. STICKWAN: I don't understand your 42 language. I don't know what you mean by biometrics. 43 You said you're going to do biometrics in the future. 44 Does that mean that you're going to be able to tell the 45 length of the king salmon through this new technology? 46 47 48 MR. PICHE: Yeah. So with the sonar, the majority of the work done on the Kenai -- and 49 50

they've done some phenomenal work, they're looking at total length of the fish. We have a real unique opportunity on our fishwheel platform where we can get an image of the fish directly behind the fishwheel platform and that fish can then be captured. And not only can we take length measurements, but we can take girth. We can -- I mean we can take -- basically biometrics are just measurements of the fish in addition to length, girth, and, you know, other such measurements.

We're not exactly sure on which ones we're going to do yet, but at least length and girth.

So the idea is that if we actually have the measurements of the fish that we imaged, then we can go back and look at that imagery taken by the sonar and we can try to figure out how accurate we can measure these fish using just sonar.

2.2

MS. STICKWAN: But you do see a few king salmon? Have you noticed small king salmons?

MR. PICHE: Overall, on the -- for the history of the project, yes. The king salmon size has steadily decreased since we began the project.

MS. STICKWAN: And small sockeyes, too?

MR. PICHE: So this -- we haven't -- we don't measure sockeye. We stopped counting sockeye once we validated the DIDSON sonar.

MS. STICKWAN: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

MR. PICHE: So it's tough for us to -for me to give you a concrete conclusion on the
sockeye. We have escape panels on our live tanks, so a
lot of the small sockeye can just escape on their own.

 $$\operatorname{So}\ I$$  don't have a good representation of sockeye.

MS. STICKWAN: Our family shares our fishwheel, so we have a lot of people using the fishwheel. But every time I use a fishwheel I got small fish like that. That's all I got. I mean I didn't get those big ones like that. I mean it was small. And it seems to me like small fish are coming

Page 240 up the river. And it's been like that for a couple of years, three years. 2 3 4 MR. PICHE: And our data supports that 5 the king salmon size has been steadily decreasing over the period of our project. 6 7 8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Matt. 9 10 Thank you Gloria. 11 12 Yeah. We're seeing smaller fish, too, But probably on the kings for sure. 13 in some cases. 14 15 Daniel. 16 MR. STEVENS: I just wanted to say 17 that, yeah, the king salmon are getting smaller. 18 Because I remember when they used to be as big as three 19 20 or four feet. 21 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Uh-huh. 2.2 23 MR. STEVENS: Especially the Tonsina 24 25 kings were huge. And we're not seeing them at all, the big fish, anymore. 26 27 28 But I want to thank you guys. Native Village of Eyak for putting this wheel up there 29 30 because it's sure giving us a lot more information than what we were getting before. 31 32 33 So thank you. 34 35 MR. PICHE: You're welcome. 36 37 MS. STICKWAN: I have another question. 38 39 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Gloria. 40 41 MS. STICKWAN: I don't understand what you said by the -- all this language about estimate 42 40,725 and then you got 48,000 and -- you know, all 43 those different language confuses me. 44 45 MR. PICHE: I know exactly what you 46 47 mean. Yep. 48 49 So because we're not counting every 50

fish on the Copper River and because of just the inherent design of a mark or capture study, we have to use statistics. So these statistics provide an abundance estimate, which for 2017 is 40,725 king salmon. That's what we believe came up the river; however, the way that the statistics work you have a lower confidence interval and an upper confidence interval. And in order for us to state that we're 95 percent confident that this is the number, we have to provide a range. So that's what range is.

Usually, I've just presented this in the past as the abundance value and I just state the standard error and the lower and the upper confidence interval, but another way of saying that is that we are 95 percent confident that the true population value —the actual population value lies within that range. So it's just another way of saying it.

It's the same information though.

MS. STICKWAN: That makes it more

23 clear.

MR. PICHE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Andy.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Just a quick comment. With your biometric data set, I think on an annual basis that's going to -- like three years ago it was just miniature reds. Not just Copper River, but the tributaries of Prince William Sound. This seems like a region-wide thing.

Maybe the common denominator is something in the ocean, of the food source or whatever, but every year the -- it's going to be different. It's almost apples and oranges. So when you collect your data set on that, one year is going to be oh, they're all about this. And then this year some big ones showed up again, but not like they used to be, you know, type thing. So anyhow.

MR. PICHE: Absolutely. And those are some of the difficulties associated with that sonar transition is you have to come up with a cutoff length.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Right.

MR. PICHE: And depending on whether -if you're going to use the large fish only method, you
would have to come up with a cutoff length and you
would have to have a way of testing that length because
your returning sockeye size might increase or your
returning king salmon might decrease.

An alternate method is to measure lengths of fish continuously throughout the season. That's been tried on the Kenai and it was fairly difficult. On the Copper we might have a bit easier time doing that because the fishwheel platforms are so effective. So we may be able to provide that length frequency information at a pretty minimal cost to inform the sonar estimate. So that's another alternative that's being looked into on the Copper River.

And I would also like to state that in addition to AKSSF, the U.S. Forest Service in Cordova has also contributed to funding the project in the future.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Ricky, you got one more question? We're going to wrap it up here.

MR. GEASE: So given that you present information with confidence intervals, that 95 percent it's -- so when we talk about 40,000 returning this year, it's really not -- it's really we're confident it's someplace between 32,000 and 48,000. You're more comfortable stating that?

MR. PICHE: Correct. It's -- but the -- so basically the way that we do this is we give this information to ADF&G and then they move on with it. So we give all of our information. It's a very open book. And how the State treats that will be up to the State.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  GEASE: Are you going to be at the Board of Fish meeting in....

MR. PICHE: I sure will be.

MR. GEASE: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: It's an

 appropriate time to address that. Yep.

```
Page 243
                     Any other comments.
 1
 2
 3
                     (No comments)
 4
 5
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Matt.
     Very good presentation.
 6
 7
 8
                     MR. PICHE:
                                  Thank you.
 9
10
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                           Donald, does
11
     anyone need a break before we do our short break?
12
13
                     MR. MIKE: Yes.
14
15
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                            Okay.
                                                  Five
16
     minutes, please.
17
18
                     Thank you.
19
                     (Off record)
20
21
2.2
                     (On record)
23
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty.
24
                                                       I'm
25
     missing a couple. Oh, they're coming.
26
                     Next item on the agenda here, we have
27
     issues for our annual report for the Council
28
     coordinator. He would like us to identify issues, if
29
30
     we have any, for the annual report. If we have none,
     that's fine.
31
32
33
                     But Donald, I'll give it to you.
34
35
                     MR. MIKE: Thank you. You'll find a
     quick annual report briefing on page 243 of your
36
37
     meeting materials.
38
39
                     ANILCA established the annual reports
     as a way to bring regional subsistence uses and needs
40
     to the Secretaries' attention. The Secretaries
41
     delegated this responsibility to the Board. Section
42
     805(c) deference includes matters brought forward in
43
     the annual report.
44
45
                     The annual report provides the Councils
46
     an opportunity to address the directors of each of the
47
     four Department of Interior agencies and the Department
48
     of Agriculture Forest Service in their capacity as
49
50
```

Page 244 members of the Federal Subsistence Board. As agency directors, the Board members have authority to 2 implement most of the actions which would affect the 3 4 changes recommended by the Councils, even those not covered in Section 805(c). 5 6 7 The Councils are strongly encouraged to 8 take advantage of this opportunity. 9 10 Thank you, Mr. Chair. 11 12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Thank you, Donald. 13 14 15 Yeah. They've got a list around 243 of report contents and so on and so forth, but if anyone 16 17 has one. 18 19 Gloria, you have one to bring up? 20 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah. But I'm not sure 21 2.2. if I can -- if it will -- this will be approved or not, but the Secretary of Interior sure has taken a long 23 time for -- the new administration taken a long time to 24 25 work on the MOA, do appointments to FACA, too. All of that stuff is slow. More than usual. And it's -- I'm 26 sure it's holding up programs, as well as the public 27 28 interest. 29 30 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That's definitely an issue. Yeah. That's one we identified. Thanks, 31 Gloria. 32 33 34 Any others. 35 Michael. 36 37 MR. OPHEIM: I think we should continue 38 39 with the climate change, water temperatures in salmon streams, things like that. Always a concern of fish 40 not coming back, being able to spawn. 41 42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Did I show you 43 the fat on that moose this year? It's going to get 44 cold. 45 46 (Laughter) 47 48 49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Okay. Не 50

wants to list that one.

Any others.

Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Well, Mr. Chair, maybe along the same lines. So we were talking about the reduction in size of some of the salmon and I think some of the proposals we had, we were making hunting dates earlier and that's probably also because of some of the changing climate, too. So I guess as a -- we're trying to do adaptive management because we're realizing that climate change is affecting fish and wildlife that we're dealing with.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well, then you could add that.

2.2

Rick.

MR. GEASE: In addition to the climate change, maybe an addendum to the climate change is the concept of acid rain in the North Pacific. The NOAA and the EPA came out last March with a study indicating that more than half the smog in west coast cities, from Seattle, Portland, Sacramento, San Francisco, L.A., and San Diego, came from East Asia, primarily Korea and Chinese origin. Smog is the primary component of either acid snow or acid rain.

So if more than half of the air pollution in west coast cities is coming from air pollution being generated in China and Korea, I would think that we're in the fallout zone in the North Pacific both in terms of snowfall and in terms of rain. And that the acid snow problem might be a very difficult thing to measure because typically in acid snow your first runoffs in the springtime is when an acid flush will go out through a watershed system. And then our monitoring isn't the first flush of water going out through. So it might be something that's just not even being detected.

And then typically when we call about ocean acidification as one of the mechanisms for ocean acidification it's in these coastal water areas where I think that issue is impacting ocean productivity. And it might be a vector or a mechanism that we're missing

in terms of a source of acidification.

21 22

 Now, the other thing that confounds it is that typically these up-welling cycles are on a 20-year cycle. So as it's not necessarily just that initial acidification if it goes down and becomes part of this cycle loop that comes up on 20-year cycles, we might be amplifying that through time. And we may have about 20 years or so behind the power curve on trying to figure out where these sources of acidification are coming from.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. That's another one to add there, Donald.

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, I know last time we did comment on ocean acidification and we did get a response from the Board on that, but I wonder if Staff can check if there is any research that's being done to measure snow or upper areas or maybe have some sort of presentation on it the next time if some of this -- some of the work might be done. The inventory and monitoring.

And just if I could ask a question then of Ricky, do you want to also have anything on the Sterling Highway as part of our annual report?

MR. GEASE: Sure. Yeah. That I think it's important to, you know, say that we continue to support a project pathway proposal that removes the additional building of a bridge and having four or five miles of the new highway just being rebuilt right along the Kenai River corridor within 100 yards of the waterway.

Any others.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. There you got your list. And if we come up with more, Donald, we'll get a hold of you. Okay? Alrighty.

Computer Matrix, LLC 135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501

Thank you.

21 22

 Okay. Next on the agenda I have a review and comments on the draft revised fishery delegation authority letter, Cook Inlet area.

Scott, you going to do that? Okay.

MR. AYERS: Okay. Just to orient everyone to where this is in the book, it starts on page 254 of the Council books.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

MR. AYERS: Good morning, Mr. Chair, Members of the Council. Again, for the record, my name is Scott Ayers and I'm a fisheries biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management.

Today I'm here to talk with you about the draft revised fisheries delegation of authority letter issued by the Federal Subsistence Board to the Federal in-season manager for Federal public waters of Cook Inlet. This draft represents the first revision to this letter since the initial 2002 draft.

So for some background, 50 CFR 100.10(d)(6) authorizes the Board to delegate to agency officials the authority to set harvest and possession limits, define harvest areas, specify methods or means of harvest, specify permit requirements, and open or close specific fish or wildlife harvest seasons within frameworks established by the Board. It also permits in-season managers to close and reopen Federal public waters to non-subsistence fishing, but does not permit specifying methods or means, permits requirements or harvest and possession limits for state-managed fisheries.

The Federal Subsistence Management Program recently engaged in a statewide review of fisheries delegation of authority letters to make administrative changes to ensure consistency across all Federal subsistence fisheries areas whenever possible and to ensure accuracy in the delegated authorities. Those administrative changes have been finalized and are reflected in all revised fisheries delegation of authority letters.

Computer Matrix, LLC 135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501

In addition to administrative changes, two letters are undergoing further review and comment related to issues specific to particular fisheries, which brings us back to the revised draft Cook Inlet area delegation letter in front of you today. This draft revised delegation of authority letter is on your agenda as a result of the newly signed settlement agreement between the Ninilchik Traditional Council and the Federal Subsistence Board, Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Among other items, the settlement agreement stipulates that Federal Subsistence Board will engage in a review of the 2002 Cook Inlet delegation letter to ensure consistency with the Board's Tribal consultation policy and with current conservation and subsistence fishing issues for the Kenai. It further stipulates that as a part of the review process the Board will provide the Ninilchik Traditional Council with any revisions that it may propose to the delegation letter and a 30-day window for them to respond with comments on the letter and the proposed revisions.

Following review and comment by the Ninilchik Traditional Council the Board is to provide the draft delegation letter to the Council for further review. I want to note that the reference to the Board's Tribal consultation policy was added to all fisheries delegation of authority letters during the application of administrative changes. This language is reflected in Section 6, on page four of the Cook Inlet delegation letter.

Today we are requesting the Council's comments on the highlighted scope of delegation section in the revised draft letter. Any comments or revisions offered by the Council will be forwarded along with those provided by the Ninilchik Traditional Council to the Board for their consideration.

If it pleases the Council and with prior permission provided by the Ninilchik Traditional Council, I'd like to summarize the comments and suggestions provided by them.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go right ahead.

MR. AYERS: Okay. The Ninilchik Traditional Council states the current draft letter of delegated authority fails to identify or establish a clear framework for how in-season decisions are made and as such confounds the spirit of the agreement.

Specific thresholds should be identified that would trigger an in-season management decision to restrict or close take. Specific language should be added stipulating that subsistence uses of a resource will not be restricted until after all other non-subsistence uses of that resource are restricted. Opportunity to harvest a resource by subsistence users should not be restricted if that harvest is either negligible or zero. Any closures of subsistence fisheries need to be based upon current subsistence harvest data.

The current draft letter references specific terms such as current biological information without providing definitions. These should be added.

And lastly, the Ninilchik Traditional Council requested a Tribal consultation to further discuss revisions that would include a framework for in-season decision-making.

 So with that, I'm prepared to answer any questions and record Council comments and/or suggestions to be forwarded to the Federal Subsistence Board.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Scott. Very, very good. Obviously, you got my comments, but it's okay.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Comments. I'll open it up. Questions for Scott.

Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Scott, I can't quite remember on other delegations of authority, does it talk about

Page 250 consultation or communication with the RAC? 2 MR. AYERS: I believe that in all of 3 4 the letters it does talk about discussion with the Chair of the Councils. 5 6 7 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. 8 9 MR. AYERS: Oftentimes in-season 10 management decisions are -- happen on a relatively fast 11 basis in order to take care of things and so trying to convene the entire Council for their feedback would be 12 difficult in a time sensitive situation, but it does 13 mention the Chair. 14 15 MS. CAMINER: I did misstate that. 16 didn't mean the Chair. And where do we have that in 17 18 here? 19 20 MR. AYERS: Yeah. It's in Section 5H. I believe it's in another section as well. 21 2.2. 23 Okay. Very good. Thank MS. CAMINER: 24 you. 25 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Questions. 26 27 Go ahead, Rick. 28 29 30 MR. GEASE: So on the -- is this the appropriate time to ask -- flesh out Ninilchik's 31 comment or your comment about specific numbers and 32 thresholds for closing a primarily sockeye fishery? 33 34 What those numbers would be? 35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I don't think so, 36 but I don't know. I know the Council is going to give 37 38 a presentation in the fishery..... 39 40 MR. GEASE: Okay. 41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Didn't I have 42 that on? The Council is going to give a presentation 43 here shortly. And as far as this going back, this is 44 just a comment period between you and the Council for 45 now with the Ninilchik's specific comments. 46 47 Thank you, Scott. 48 49 50

Page 251 He wants to catch you on the run. 1 2 Ricky, go ahead. 3 4 5 (Laughter) 6 7 MR. GEASE: Not to be contrary, but in Cook Inlet what specifically do you consider the 8 Federal public waters to non-subsistence fishing? 9 10 11 MR. AYERS: So Federal public waters are the Federal public waters that are available for 12 subsistence uses. So for instance, within the area 13 that's been in question quite a bit recently for the 14 15 last couple of years with the community gillnet fishery, we've referred to the Moose Range Meadows area 16 within the Refuge there. Within the specific bounds. 17 And so I believe that what that speaks to is the State-18 managed fishery that is through the river, but also the 19 non -- the delegation of authority would be referencing 20 those specific Refuge waters. 21 2.2 23 The non-subsistence fishing occurring within those waters. 24 25 MR. GEASE: 26 Okay. Thank you. 27 28 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right. 29 Thanks. 30 Next we've got -- I got my thing 31 talking here, I hope. Next we've got agency reports. 32 33 Agency reports. And we're going to start out with the 34 Tribal governments. And I see Ivan, Ninilchik 35 Traditional Council is next. 36 37 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Council. For the record, my 38 name is Ivan Encelewski and I'm the executive director 39 for the Ninilchik Traditional Council. And I'm going 40 41 to kind of give the report today for NTC specifically related to the Kenai and Kasilof gillnet fisheries. 42 43 And just for the record also, I did 44 bring copies and they're on the back table here as 45 well. One is the Kasilof and one is the Kenai report. 46 And hopefully those were passed out to you guys as 47 well. And if you do need or request us to email a 48 digital copy to you or anyone, just let me know as 49

well. I'd be happy to do that.

I guess I'll start with the Kasilof subsistence fishery report. And I'll try and be -- just briefly go through it. And I apologize that Darrel Williams, the resource manager, was unable to be here today. He fishes every day on the river, so he might have a little bit more information on detailed specifics, but I'll try and answer any of your questions as best as I can.

So the regulatory requirements are listed on page five. And I think you guys are pretty well aware of the regulatory requirements for the Kasilof. The Kasilof is a little bit different because it's I guess listed as experimental five-year temporary and it requires a plan to be approved with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and some additional requirements. But I won't go into all that.

2.2

The fishery starts on June 16th and ends on August 15th. And it still uses the 10 fathom gillnet. So the gear type we use is the same as that we've been talking about. The 10 fathoms, five and a quarter inch mesh. Pretty standard.

So on page six it talks about the harvesting practice. So the net is set out. There's three techniques that are identified for the fishery, but the only technique that we used was the set gillnet, which was on a running line pulling it out. So the net's placed in the water for a maximum of 30 minutes and then it's pulled to shore. So it can take anywhere from 5 to 30 minutes to check the net.

They can visually see most of the fish that are caught and splash. So when the fish are caught they're identified by species, reduced from the net and the water, and placed in the submerged recovery box on site. So on the Kasilof site we have a recovery box that we're required to use as far as the operational plan. So the recovery box consists of a wire mesh box and it's placed in the river. The dimensions are 36 by 24 by 24. So this allows us to kind of selectively harvest fish.

On page seven, at the top, you'll see that the fish were removed and data is logged on field data sheets. So they -- the field data sheets identify

the date, the start time, and the designated fishers, the set number, method, all those different things that are identified for reporting purposes.

4 5 6 7

So the original plan consisted of taking multiple harvest limits in a day. So we use -on the Kasilof we have a designated fishery permit, which allows individual subsistence users to harvest I think up to two additional harvest limits for other subsistence users.

10 11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

8

9

2

3

So interesting there, there's a Gantt chart provided which talks about -- kind of shows for the day how we do this fishery. So we mobilize the boat and gear from about 9:00 to 10:00 in the morning. It takes about an hour to set the gear. Fish in the net, you know, in a typical day averaged about 3.2 hours of actual soak time. So that's in water fishing time. And then it talks about the travel time.

19 20 21

2.2

23

So on the fishery for the Kasilof for 2017 we had one wild chinook salmon and two lake trout, as far as non-targeted fish, which were all released successfully.

24 25 26

27

28

29

On page eight you can see the site location. It's just upstream from the boat launch there on the Kasilof. And we did this year -- did try a second site across from the first site. And you can see that on the starred map.

30 31 32

33

34

35

36

37

Page nine through eleven just kind of show the permit. So each individual that wants to participate in the fishery gets a permit from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and then that permit is brought to the Ninilchik Traditional Council offices and they're signed up on a first come, first served basis. And then fish are allocated about that.

38 39 40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

On page 12 we talk about distribution. So it talks a little bit about how the fish are distributed. The only thing I would say on that -some people -- because there's a Kasilof and a Kenai fishery, some people would be like well, I just want fish from the Kenai because they're larger and whatnot. So some people have a preference. And sometimes it --I wouldn't say it creates a big problem, but it -- you know, it just creates an issue with people that may not want to receive fish on the Kasilof versus the Kenai.

So on page 13 it talks about the species and the numbers harvested. And it kind of just shows you the days of the fishing. And as you could see, things didn't really start showing up until around the 20th of June. And then the 21st and 22nd. What I've noticed on the -- or what we've noticed on the Kasilof is Kasilof's very acutely cyclic, so you can fish one day and get quite a few fish and the next day you get very few. Unlike in the Kenai, you start to see a buildup and the run strength will kind of move through and you'll start to get pretty good fishery. It's much more sporadic on the Kasilof.

So each day we're, you know, logging these and reporting them. This report talks a little bit about gillnet injury on the last paragraph. Didn't cause any injuries. No fish were bleeding from the gills. Generally, the fish were exhausted from becoming tangled in the net. They were identified at the water line when checking the net.

And then when the sockeye was identified as the harvest species they were reduced from the net and placed in the recovery box. And the fish that were identified for harvest that were not treated as non-target fish and frequently moved from water to managed fish handling in the water and expedite the fish harvest. So it talks a little bit about -- the estimated mortality of target fish in the net was less than five percent did not recover in the recovery box.

So a little bit about the fish condition. Varied. And we noticed this from, you know, saltwater fish to freshwater fish. There were some instances where we're catching fish who had previously been netted, escaped or released. You could see from the harm, injury to the fish.

Page 14 just shows kind of some of the photos of how this net is out. And you could see in the early part of the season on the Kasilof the water level's way down, so you get quite a bit more bank there. And as the water level progresses as the time goes on it gets quite a bit higher.

So yeah, you can just kind of look through some of those pictures on page 17. You could show removing the dorsal fin is one of the markings of

subsistence fish versus cutting the tails I think in the State fishery. So just some more pictures of how the....

You can see there on page 20 and 21 we did encounter one chinook and put it in the live recovery box. And was successfully released. So we're taking measurements and DNA sampling.

And on page 24 we had a little critter that was checking our fish-friendly net.

## (Laughter)

MR. ENCELEWSKI: So on page 25, on the Kasilof we're using a again designated fishery permit. And then you could see the reports that -- on the designated fish report not only reporting each day -- so as the fishery manager Darrel gets done with the day, he'll send the report to Jeff of the current data sheet for the day of what was caught and harvested. But we're also required to submit those designated fishery permit at the end of the year and log those under who was fished under. And we have three main people there -- Daniel, Gina, and Darrel.

And then the other information that's just more informational there is a copy of the actual operational plan that's required for this fishery. So on page 32, it looks like about 40, just describes the operational plan. We didn't have any issues this year on the operational plan. We've worked with Jeff really well for the last several years identifying the language. And I think we were able to get it finalized in April and signed. And then the other one is just a copy of the special use conditions permit that was done a few years ago that I think is still valid. So it's just informational.

So I guess moving on to the Kenai fishery report. It's a little bit thicker. And I'll just start with the -- on page five. The big changes this year was all of the process that we've had to go through to make this fishery move forward to eliminate certain regulations and add new ones to make this all work.

And so this year it was -- in order to implement the fishery, we went through the process of a

special temporary special action as you're aware. Just as a reiteration, this removed the linkage between the community gillnet and then the other types of dipnet and rod and reel. And as you may remember, this was a concern between communities; i.e., Cooper Landing and Ninilchik. So Cooper Landing there's a 2,000 annual harvest limit and they were concerned that the fishery — the gillnet would take up that harvest limit.

And so by separating that out and having no annual harvest limit that was removed. So there was no competition between communities for, you know, potentially harvesting all the sockeye. So that was the rationale for one.

Two, the retention of mortality. Yeah. If we're not allowed to retain dead resident species, that was an issue. We established an early chinook run of no more than 50 with a slot limit from July 1st to 15th. And then the closure of up to 200 late run chinook between July 16th and 15th. And then the closure of the fishery prior to any time if 200 of the late run chinook are met. And then of course the live release of rainbow and Dolly Varden within a counter of no more than 100 rainbow and 150 Dollies.

So the participation on harvest limit on page six was very similar. We went through the same process to have individuals -- we notified the community. Put up notices around. People had to go into the office. And most of them probably got their Kasilof and Kenai permits at the same time when they went to the Fish and Wildlife office. So again we went through the practice of how distributing fish.

We only encountered a few situations where because we kept a first come, first serve. So when people would go to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife office, get their permit, and then come to our office and sign up on the list, then we'd kind of go through a first come, first served process. But sometimes you would not be able to get a hold of that person that day. Say you went out fishing that day and that person — you call that person and they weren't available, so then you'd go down to the next person on the list.

And we encountered a few issues where some people didn't want all the limit of their fish, so maybe their eligible household limit was 30 and they

only wanted 10. So then we would give them 10 and move down the list again. So things like that.

We had an individual that didn't want sockeye. They just wanted chinook. And because we didn't catch chinook, they -- we just told them okay. So we moved down the list. Gear type was the same, identical as the Kasilof.

On page eight, you'll notice the harvesting practice. And a little bit different on the Kasilof. Because on Kasilof we're having a 30-minute soak time as part of the operational plan. On the Kenai the water is very swift moving and it's very difficult to set out the net. And so you're not able to just quickly, easily just pull that net in and out.

So the practice is to be running that net. And pretty much as soon as a fish is hit, the fishery -- because you can wade this. This is a fishery where you can wade up and down the net in the river. So it's not like you're using a boat or anything to get the fish out. You're just walking the net.

So the net is actively monitored that way. By just taking the fish. And there's somebody in the boat or onshore monitoring that. And this is just an example of that harvest. Showing at certain set times during the -- while the net's in the water that the -- how the fish are being done -- or caught for the day. So it's just another example of, you know, making sure that we're being proactive and, you know, recording how many fish are being caught at a certain time.

Non-targeted fish. There was no non-targeted fish encountered during the 2017 fishery. So there was no resident species, either Dolly or rainbows encountered for the entire fishery. And that included the early and the late season or I guess the first and the second season. We did encounter and harvest one chinook in the late season and that was the only chinook that we encountered all year.

The site location is the similar site location that we used last year and it's just below the power line there and in the Moose Range Meadows. And it kind of just gives you a site location.

Computer Matrix, LLC 135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501

21 22

11 through 13 just describes the permits. And Jeff would have more detailed information on the permits, but I think there's, you know, probably close to 90 permittees or something like that -- that household. So the increased -- there was definitely an increase in participation.

Page 14 is really important because it kind of gives you the spreadsheet of the actual days that were harvest every day. So you'll see in there one thing we did is we fished in the Kasilof, you know, because it opens earlier. And then when the fishery first opened -- I think it opens July 1st in the Kenai. And so that was a weekend.

So we set out on the 3rd of July, was our first day, and we didn't catch anything. And so what we decided to do was go back to the Kasilof. And fished in the Kasilof time because realizing that the fish hasn't come in in the Kasilof -- or in the Kenai yet.

So we didn't start again fishing until the 10th of July. And on the 10th you could see we harvested six fish in three hours. And so if you look at that spreadsheet there, the fish really didn't -- I mean they came in a little bit the middle of July, but it was really that 25th to the beginning of August that really the fish started coming in for the sockeye.

So we harvested 2,169 sockeye. The average soak time was about four hours. So we're fishing about four hours a day of actual fishing time in the water. As noted there, we did catch one chinook at the end of September. There was twelve harvested coho and it looks like there about nine pink. Somewhere around there. So almost exclusively a sockeye fishery.

A little bit of the gillnet.

Interesting on the fish conditions. You'll see some of the different things. And I'm not the biologist, but different things. And Darrel had reported these before. Some of the parasites, some of the markings, injuries.

More pictures showing kind of how the net looks in the Kenai. It's done very closely to the bank in that section. And basically what we recognized

-- because this is an area -- as you can see, you can wade it. Like on page 21, where you can see it's about, you know, a little over knee high. There it's a kind of shallow channel where the kings tend to go out in the middle -- run up through the middle channels. And there's sport fishermen a lot of times outside of that. So pretty reasonable based on the data that the king salmon aren't running real close to the bank like this, which has kind of made it into a fishery that has proven to be really successful at targeting sockeye.

So just a lot of pictures going through there. Several seals. I was actually up there on a few days and there's quite a few seals up there at mile 28. Quite a ways up the river encountered quite a few. So mostly pictures.

And so then the special action is just more of informational. Was that the special action was completed this spring in order to implement the issues that weren't able to be approved by the Federal Subsistence Board at the time. And so there's still a long, convoluted process to continue this fishery, to make it permanent.

The settlement agreement was approved. I just got a copy just here a few minutes ago of the signed commitment letter from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Federal Subsistence Board as well. So we'll be moving forward in a collaborative effort to continue to make this happen.

There will be some things that have to happen at the Federal Subsistence Board in spring of 2018. Of course we share the frustration of not being able to have, you know, things posted in the Federal Register and the slow moving of the -- the Federal government has really stymied this process moving forward. But we may have to at worst case scenario do another special action in 2018. A temporary special action to continue the fishery prior to the permanent regulations being approved. But we're hopeful. And I think everyone's kind of now on the same page of moving this process forward.

So I'd be happy to answer any questions regarding the fisheries or -- I didn't mention.

I think there was about 315 sockeye

taken in the Kasilof and about 2,169 in the Kenai. So about 2,500 sockeye for the community. And one thing that's not in the report there is just that, you know, this is an important fishery for our community because, you know, we have an educational net.

A lot of times people like to say well, you have all these other opportunities. Well, we do have an educational net on the State level, which is not subsistence. But that allows us to fish with two nets in the Cook Inlet all summer long at two sites and in the Kasilof in the later season. And we harvested only about 600 sockeye in those two nets all summer long between those for -- so what we can do in a short period on the Kenai and even in the Kasilof can outdo fishing every day in the Cook Inlet with the 10 fathom net. So it's proved to be very effective.

21 22

And we're starting to see anecdotally, you know, the people are, you know, pleased to be able to get some fish. And I think it's -- you know, when you don't catch any resident species all year long in the Kenai and only one king salmon, I think it's been a successful fishery.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Ivan. We'll open it up for questions. Good report.

I did note one page Darrel needs to make a correction on the Kenai. It says Kasilof.

Go ahead, Ed.

MR. HOLSTON: Yeah. As you probably know, the communities of Cooper Landing and Hope have been -- have been adamantly opposed to -- for a variety of reasons to the gillnetting on the Kenai River. I think the results of this year will go a long way to alleviate those concerns. There's always going to be people that aren't going to buy off on it and I think your explanation -- I think one of the concerns that --would be your impact on the chinook. And I was surprised that you only caught one chinook. But after listening to you and your report on net placement and away from the basic pathway of chinook probably explains your low catch.

And kind of on a somewhat related from Cooper Landing, we have our own dipnet up at the falls,

and which I participate in, a lot of the community participates in. And this is just a question that -- I'd kind of make it a plea for more enforcement on that fisheries up there. Because I go up -- I probably go up there six times a year as a designated fisherman for other permit holders. And I've noted very little enforcement from -- and I know enforcement is tough for both Forest Service and Fish and Wildlife due to funding and personnel, but I've noted quite a bit of abuse of that fisheries from non-permit holders up there. Because it's a very easy public access.

You go down the falls, fish below the falls, and everybody -- you just have to start driving people off. Because even though you show them your permit and there's signage up there, we've seen a lot of abuse of that fishery up there. And I think a little bit more of enforcement would really help.

 Some of the most grievous incidents that I've seen have been with foreigners. You know, people from other countries. Because they don't -- you know, it's tough. They can -- I won't go into detail what we've seen up there, but even if they're cited, they're gone in two, three days back to wherever.

So a little more presence of enforcement would help our fisheries out.

So that's about all I want to say.

 And I want to thank NTC for their openness on their data, which I distribute to Cooper Landing and Hope residents. And that's gone a long way to alleviate those concerns.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thanks, Ed. Good comments.

Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. Thanks, Ivan, for good presentations as always.

And maybe for our annual report I would suggest that we add Ed's concern about additional enforcement at the falls. That's really valuable information to have and for the Board and Forest Service to be aware of, of course.

I was going to ask Ivan if -- when or if you will then submit next year's plans of operation.

3 4 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Mr. Chair, Ms. Caminer, so because they're two separate fisheries, the 5

Kasilof -- we'll probably work with Jeff again in the springtime. We'll submit a new operational plan. requires continuing that process, which we don't

anticipate any problems.

2

6 7

8

9 10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 2.2

23

24

25 26 27

28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36 37 38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 48

49 50

Not to get out -- off subject, but we'll have to look at the issue of the Kasilof because it does have a five-year sunset clause. And we put in to make that permanent and as you know, the OSM and the Federal Subsistence Board didn't support us on that. But I think it's something that because it hasn't been published in the Federal Register.

And I made this on record at our last RAC meeting is that we have to decide whether we'll do a request for consideration or file just a new proposal to make that process permanent. Because that would be the process whereby we could go to the Kenai process where we're already named and we could kind of eliminate some of this over burden of regulations.

On the Kenai side it's very, very, very convoluted because of the -- as you know, that lawsuit is settled. That we're working -- the commitment letter has been signed by the Federal Subsistence Board and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, so the process moving -- well, we obviously need the actions in the January meeting posted in the Federal Register. That would be a first step, you know. And then the Federal Subsistence Board has to take up the new permanent regulations in this upcoming spring.

If that's not able to be finalized and posted in the Federal Register prior to the new season in 2018 for the Kenai, then it will require a temporary special action again, which then we would as part of the settlement agreement and the commitment letter that U.S. Fish and Wildlife has signed, they will work with us. And I'm sure OSM and others will work with us. And they worked with us really well in this last year to get that done.

So it's just -- it's unfortunate it's -- you know, I would say if the Federal government

Computer Matrix, LLC 135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501

Page 263 would step up their process of posting things in the Federal Register and getting, you know, the Department 2 of Interior kind of moving a little bit quicker, we 3 could get this done. But I guess my personal opinion 4 is probably at a 50/50 shot of having to do a temporary 5 special action again. Because if the regulations 6 aren't permanent and finalized in 2018, it'll create an 7 8 issue. 9 10 So that's kind of the process moving 11 forward. But I can say that I think everybody's working together and we're very pleased with everything 12 that we've seen on our end with Fish and Wildlife 13 Service, with everyone. So I don't anticipate any 14 15 issues other than logistical challenges. 16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: 17 Ricky. 18 19 MR. GEASE: Since I'm trying to comply 20 with the Paperwork Reduction Act, can we get this in electronic format? 21 2.2 23 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Absolutely. 24 25 MR. GEASE: Okay. Thanks. 26 MR. ENCELEWSKI: And I mentioned to Mr. 27 Holston that anybody that wants electronic copies to 28 just let me know. And I can send you and Ed and anyone 29 else that wants a copy electronically. 30 31 I was just told -- and it's our fault, 32 but, you know, in order to get the information in the 33 34 packets we had to meet a deadline. And we didn't. 35 Donald says we've got to bring 50 copies, which is fine. It's no problem. 36 37 38 (Laughter) 39 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I want to make sure 40 41 you guys have the information. 42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You need to send 43 44 Donald the Paper Act. 45 46 (Laughter) 47 48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any other questions on the presentation. 49 50

```
Page 264
                     Thank you very much, Ivan.
                                                  There's
     that one little correction like I said on that one
 2
     page. And very good.
 3
 4
 5
                     Thank you.
 6
 7
                     MR. ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Mr.
 8
     Chairman, Members of the RAC.
 9
10
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                            Okay. Next we
11
     have Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission. And we
     kind of did part of that yesterday. We did a pretty
12
     good report. But you're welcome to come, Karen.
13
14
15
                     MS. LINNELL: I think we.....
16
17
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You pretty well
18
     covered it?
19
                     MS. LINNELL: Yeah. I think we
20
21
     covered....
2.2
23
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.
24
25
                     MS. LINNELL: .....just about
26
     everything yesterday. Thank you, sir.
27
28
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. You're
29
     welcome.
               Thank you.
30
                     Okay. Next we have U.S. Fish and
31
     Wildlife Service Kenai National Wildlife Refuge.
32
33
34
                           It was worth that wait, right?
                     See.
35
                     MR. ESKELIN:
                                   Oh, boy.
36
37
                     (Laughter)
38
39
40
                     MR. ESKELIN: Thank you, Council and
41
     Chair. For the record, Todd Eskelin, Kenai National
     Wildlife Refuge.
42
43
                     I do want to note that I was called out
44
     on not bringing donuts.
45
46
47
                     (Laughter)
48
49
                     MR. ESKELIN:
                                   And as many times as I
50
```

heard about your moose, I'm surprised that we didn't have any lunch here today.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, it ain't

lunch yet.

21 22

(Laughter)

MR. ESKELIN: Just a couple of quick things. You know, the FM15-05 moose hunt doesn't officially end until after our fall RAC meeting, so just enough to eat on last year at the end of the season. I don't know how much the members differed from what I reported last time, but there were 12 moose harvested and five of those were cows -- five of the eight quota that we have set each year.

And then so far this year you'll see the number of permits was down a little bit. The bottom line there in 2017 was 94 permits. Seven moose harvested and 2 of those were cows. Of the other five, I believe only one of them would have been legal under the State regulations, so six of the seven were directly resulting from the additional advantages that the subsistence permit offers.

So far we've only had one harvest during the late season, which is pretty typical. I think it's a combination of a lot of people are pretty suspect that the moose are still pretty stinky. And I think we've had -- I think on average we have one to two moose harvested during the late season. And honestly we're fine with that because we've had a lot of discussion of a lot of these other proposals about these, you know, larger post-reg aggregations of bulls and cows and it's really not the best time to be chasing moose around.

And so the folks that have participated in that late hunt generally take a smaller bull and most them tell me they're still pretty stinky even when they're harvesting a smaller bull. So I think that's probably all I have on the numbers if there's any questions about that portion of it.

I have one other thing to mention, too, but I'll wait for questions on this.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any questions on

Computer Matrix, LLC 135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501

```
Page 266
     his report, the numbers.
 2
 3
                     (No comments)
 4
 5
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Just go ahead on
     the other then.
 6
 7
 8
                     MR. ESKELIN:
                                   Yeah.
                                           The only other
     thing I had to report was I did have a couple of
 9
10
     different hunters reported to me that they were
     disappointed with the designated hunter program, the
11
     way it's working on the Kenai.
12
13
                     It's really of no consequence to the
14
     Refuge as far as how the RAC or the Subsistence Board
15
     manages a designated hunter program, but what a lot of
16
     hunters were complaining about is that the majority of
17
     the people putting in for a designated hunter are
18
     basically putting in other family members in their same
19
     household, getting a moose, tagging it on their wife's
20
     as a designated hunter or kids, and then continuing to
21
2.2
     hunt for more moose. And on the Kenai with, you know,
23
     94 permits and only seven moose harvested.
24
25
                     I don't think it's been an issue
                   I don't think there's very -- there's
26
     number-wise.
     hardly been a situation where the designated hunter
27
     thing has successfully put two moose in the same
28
     household, but I just mentioned it as -- because out of
29
     the responsibility of the other hunters reporting it to
30
     me, I'm passing it on.
31
32
33
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                            Okay.
                                                   Thanks.
34
35
                     Any other questions.
36
37
                     (No comments)
38
39
                     Todd, appreciate the donuts.
                                                    Thank
     you.
40
41
                     (Laughter)
42
43
                     MR. ESKELIN: I'll look for that back
44
45
     strap next meeting.
46
                     (Laughter)
47
48
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: How about Kenai
49
50
```

field office. There we go.

MR. ANDERSON: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Council Members.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Good morning.

MR. ANDERSON: For the record, my name is Jeff Anderson. I'm the field supervisor at the Kenai Fish and Wildlife Conservation Office. And in that capacity I've been delegated authority from the Federal Board to manage Federal subsistence fisheries in the Cook Inlet area.

I've got a report again. I brought 50 copies as well, but mine's only a half a sheet of paper. So.....

(Laughter)

MR. ANDERSON: So anyway, hopefully you have that in front of you. Ivan talked about the gillnet fisheries on the Kenai and Kasilof Rivers. I'll focus more on the other fisheries and just the numbers of permits.

So Ivan mentioned we saw -- we did see about a doubling of the permits for folks in Ninilchik this year. So, you know, last year they were a little bit under 100 and this year over 200 permits issues for Ninilchik residents. Cooper Landing and Hope were about the same as last year for number of permits, so a total of 364 for all fisheries and all communities issued this year versus I think 227 last year.

So as of a few days ago, October 31st is when I put this summary report together. Subsistence users have until January 15th of next year to actually turn in their harvest report, so I won't have final numbers probably until sometime in February. I usually give folks a courtesy letter on or about January 15th if they haven't turned in their reports. I give them a little bit more time to get those in.

But as of now -- as of a few days ago anyway, we've got about 1,700 sockeye harvested from the Kenai River versus a total harvest last year of about 1,600. So folks seemed to do a little bit better dipnetting this year than last year. And I think the

```
Page 268
     primary fishery this year was residents of Cooper
     Landing and Hope. And I think they were more
 2
     successful or at least more -- more fish were harvested
 3
 4
     during the early run than the late run up at the
     Russian River falls this year. And so far to date
 5
     there has been one chinook harvested actually in the
 6
     Kenai rod and reel fishery reported to date. And again
 7
     reports will continue through January 15th of 2018.
 8
 9
10
                     And with that I'm happy to answer any
11
     questions anyone might have.
12
13
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Ouestions.
14
15
                     Go ahead, Judy.
16
                     MS. CAMINER: Thanks, Jeff. That was
17
     really helpful. So perhaps after your January data is
18
     all in and you've compiled it, would you be able to
19
20
     send it to Donald to send to all of us then?
21
2.2
                     MR. ANDERSON: Through the Chair.
23
     I usually do send the final report once I get the final
     numbers.
24
25
26
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Very good.
                                                        Is
     there any other questions.
27
28
29
                     (No comments)
30
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                           Thank you, Jeff.
31
32
                     How about the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
33
     Service Cordova District.
34
35
                     IN UNISON: Forest Service.
36
37
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Forest Service.
38
39
     Sorry.
40
41
                     (Laughter)
42
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I take that back.
43
44
                     (Laughter)
45
46
                     MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Chairman, Council
47
     Members. Again, my name is Tom Whitford. I'm the
48
     Regional Subsistence Program leader for the Forest
49
50
```

Service. I did put a copy of a report in your spots this morning. Then there's also some extra copies over at -- on the table.

I'll highlight a couple of things out of this report so I won't be reading the whole thing. The report in front of you -- it outlines some of the 2017 accomplishments of the Forest Service on the Tongass and the Chugach National Forest. So I encourage you to read about those.

And then we did highlight a couple of different projects in our program. One would be the Neva Lake weir. That's been ongoing since 2002 through 2017, so you guys can read about that.

2.2.

And then I think Milo will be discussing his ongoing black bear monitoring project on the Chugach.

What I'll focus on quickly is the 2018 operating budget for this year. Again, we have two and a half million dollars that will spread across the region. A little over 700,000 of that will be at the regional office level. Around 280,000 will be on the Chugach and a little over 1.5 million will be on the Tongass National Forest. And then there's some miscellaneous stuff for a little over 6,000. And with these funds we will continue to meet our responsibilities under ANILCA.

The proposed funding level will enable the Forest Service to continue to fund approximately 40 seasonal employees that collect fish and wildlife population data in Southeast and Southcentral Alaska. A minimum of \$700,000 will go to the Tongass National Forest's FRMP project funding. This funding will support three to five FRMP projects in 2018.

A minimum of 70,000 will be allocated to the Chugach National Forest to continue their black bear monitoring project and also to help develop cooperative projects with the Native Village of Eyak and also with the development of an FRMP program on the Chugach.

We will also in 2018 continue to fund through an interagency agreement with the Office of Subsistence Management which helps fund these two

Page 270 Advisory Councils -- Southeast, Southcentral, anthropology, then also part of their fishery program. 2 Like I forget who mentioned it earlier. We did help 3 4 fund one of the FRMP projects on the Copper River. We helped with reconstruction of their fishwheel in 2017. 5 6 7 We also supply some funding -- it will be 50,000 this year -- to law enforcement. And someone 8 just mentioned that there's potentially some law 9 10 enforcement issues up at Russian River falls and we'll 11 be checking in on that. Because that's the first time we've heard of that. 12 13 That's all I have. 14 15 16 Any questions on my part. 17 18 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Questions. 19 (No comments) 20 21 2.2 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You must have 23 done good. Thank you. 24 25 (Laughter) 26 27 Thank you. MR. WHITFORD: 28 29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. 30 MR. BURCHAM: Milo Burcham, Chugach 31 National Forest. Good morning or almost afternoon, 32 everybody. I'll introduce myself, David Pearson, the 33 34 natural resource specialist on the Kenai. But I'll 35 introduce in the audience here we have Francisco Sanchez, district ranger for the Seward District at 36 Moose Pass, and then Jason Stansell, law enforcement, 37 is in the back. And I'll give you an update on 38 personnel here, here in a second. 39 40 41 I'll try to keep this quick. the biggest thing that we have going on on the forest 42 right now is the forest plan revision. I'll try to be 43 nice about what I say here. Many of us are hoping this 44 goes away, but it won't until we're finished. We're 45 getting closer. But it's been a priority for many 46 employees on the forest here recently. 47 48 We've responded to scoping comments on 49 50

the plan released in December 2015 and have designed alternatives based on those comments. We are currently engaging the regional office to review the plan and draft an environmental impact statement, as well as the Washington office, including the chief's office.

The draft plan includes some new language addressing subsistence. The proposed plan and draft EIS should be released for a 90-day comment period in January of '18 and documents will be available on our website. We'll respond to comments, make adjustments, and release the final plan and final environmental impact statement for a 60-day objection period during fall of 2018 is the plan right now.

Special actions. We didn't take any special actions this past year. Agreements. We have a continuing cost share agreement with Alaska Department of Fish and Game, helping fund monitoring of moose, of caribou, mountain goats, you know, to both the Cordova office and the Kenai office.

We started a new cost share agreement with the Native Village of Eyak and gave them \$60,000 to go towards their Copper River fishwheel project. And we started a new cost agreement with the Prince William Sound Science Center to begin a project. \$20,000 to fund research to look at the effect of egg harvest on the Gull Island where a gull harvest, an egg harvest season began a few years ago under a different subsistence program than ours right here.

I'll give you some updates on some of the species important to subsistence on the forest. Moose in particular. And I'll talk about the Prince William Sound area. You know, Cordova area right now. The population was last surveyed in 2014. The population was estimated at over 600 moose. We believe we're even higher than that now and probably nearing or at all time highs. There's very high twinning rates and there's a report attached to this. And you have my document that I left on your -- at your spots on the first day. And there's a stack of them there.

But I attached the twinning report. That's -- we fund -- Fish and Game -- to do some of this work. And it's their management report that I've attached here. And because of the health of the population and the health of the habitat as indexed by

the twinning rates, last year the AC, working with Fish and Game and myself, increased the management goal from 4 to 500 moose to 6 to 800 moose. So we're sitting pretty good in that department.

As I mentioned yesterday, we received 1,070 applications for moose permits this year. We issued 80 permits. There were 15 permits on the State side. We issued 45 cow and 35 -- or 45 bull and 35 cow permits. The cow season has just concluded and 33 of the 35 cows were harvested. The bull season is still running.

The Forest Service and Native Village of Eyak are continuing habitat improvement, hydro-axing on the Copper River Delta and have basically started a new plan to treat 1,000 acres in the future.

And we completed deer transects in the spring. The deer population in Prince William Sound is recovering nicely from the big winter we had 2011/12. After three mild winters where results of deer pellet transects weren't really comparable to the historical data because we basically had no winter, finally we got almost a normal winter. And the results were comparable and they showed we're doing quite well. In fact, the highest indexes -- deer pellet per plot indexes since 1998. And that report is attached to the back of here, which you might find interesting.

And then black bear project. So we continued work on the cooperative black bear study. I'm working with the Fish and Game biologist in Cordova on this. We moved from Esther Island to Knight Island in Prince William Sound this summer. We had 38 captures of 33 different bears. It brings the total bears we've handled up to 58 for the two seasons. And we have 33 collars deployed and we're getting a lot of data. We'll have one more season of trapping this coming year, but that program is going really, really well and we're learning a lot along the way.

There's a fresh water fishery on the Copper River Delta and we issued over 100 permits this year, but we don't have the results of those and won't until this winter. But in 2016 555 coho and 234 sockeye were reported harvested in that fishery.

And then before I go to the Kenai I'll

give you some personnel updates. Mostly Jeff Briden, who's -- we've paid subsistence money. Even though he's law enforcement, we've paid some of his time to help implement the management program. And he retired in June, so we'll miss him. He was a great asset both in the field and helping issue permits and contacting people on the Kenai. But we have had Jason Stansell filling his shoes for this season. But he's just recently taken a job in recreation at Girdwood. And we'll be looking for the right person -- the new law enforcement off that will be on the Kenai -- to help fill that role.

And I think that's what I needed to say there.

MR. PEARSON: David Pearson, natural resource specialist with the Chugach National Forest, Kenai Peninsula aquatic zone.

2.2

We held four public meetings to hand out permits -- moose, caribou, and salmon. Use and harvest is on par for previous few years. Thus far three out of five caribou have been harvested for caribou and one moose was taken under the Federal subsistence moose hunt FM0004. And the other thing we've been working on -- we moved our office from Seward to Moose Pass, which is a lot closer to the communities we serve, and we've been working on getting our front desk person more up-to-date with handing out subsistence permits.

So up to now they had to contact myself or a law enforcement officer and we had to arrange a meeting, so now from 8:00 o'clock to 4:30 any given day they could come to our office and get a permit. So that just simplifies handing out permits. And we still have our permit meetings, but it's just easier. If they can't catch us, there's somewhere they can go and get one on a daily basis -- as long as that position remains filled.

(Laughter)

MR PEARSON: So that's all I have.

MR. BURCHAM: Thanks. Any questions.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Andy.

```
Page 274
                     MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah.
                                              Just a quick
 2
     one.
           Thank you, Mr. Chair.
 3
 4
                     Revising back to just an old topic, the
 5
     .804 analysis that was run on the Kings Bay moose and
     that bad winter year was like when we got the snapshot
 6
 7
     in time about the low numbers and that it was closed at
     that point. At what point do you see another aerial
 8
     survey being done to make sure that is a subsistence
 9
10
     opportunity resource available to the communities of
11
     Tatitlek and Chenega Bay.
12
13
                     MR. BURCHAM:
                                   It's probably getting
14
     time to take a look at that. I'll talk to the Fish and
15
     Game biologist on the Kenai that we, you know, have
     some money with and who flew that last survey and we'll
16
     see if we can put it on the list and prioritize it.
17
     And then hope we get conditions to do that.
18
19
20
                     But yeah, thanks for the reminder.
21
2.2
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any other
23
     questions.
24
25
                     (No comments)
26
27
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                            Thank you,
28
     gentlemen.
29
30
                                   Actually, may I just add
                     MR. PEARSON:
     one thing.
31
32
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.
33
34
35
                     MR. PEARSON:
                                   We do have some LEO
     enforcement at the falls. It's all about timing.
36
     I do know I've talked to them because I have heard that
37
     complaint. And they always tell me when they go
38
     there's nothing happening. So I think maybe we'll
39
     continue that effort, but it's just about timing.
40
41
42
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Drones. Drones
43
     work good.
44
45
                     MR. PEARSON: I'm sure you want a bunch
     of government drones.
46
47
48
                     (Laughter)
49
50
```

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. National Park Service.

 MR. SARAFIN: Good morning. Dave Sarafin, fishery biologist with Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. I'll be leading off with the fisheries part of our report anyways here and then passing you over to Judy Putera after this.

So both weirs Tanada Creek and Long Lake operated successfully this year again. They both employ local hire residents. Tanada Creek's vital for the Batzulnetas fishery in that area. Table 1 shows historic counts along with five year and ten year averages from both weirs. For 2017 Tanada Creek counted 23,849 slightly above average. Actually, it shows the range on there. Not the -- it's just the ten year average, I guess. So it's slightly above average.

21 22

The chinook salmon was four, which is -- it's typical if you weed out the one strange here where we had 137 that showed up probably from another creek washing out to where salmon moved in from another location.

Long Lake has had a -- this year we really discovered an extensive beaver dam problem on the -- it's approximate three mile stretch of slow flow creek. A little trickle between the lake and the Lakina River there. And it delayed -- we weren't getting fish until someone went down and started taking out some of the beaver dams they were rebuilding. So I think it affected this year's run, as well as last year's pretty substantially there. So it is an issue we'll be addressing for next year.

For the burbot -- we also did some burbot research monitoring in Lake -- it's an OSM funded project. We're midway through it. It's a four-year project. It's looking at small lakes of the Upper Yukon and Tanana Drainage that are within the Park. This year we went to sample Carden Lake and also Bray Lakes. And both of those lakes we did not find burbot in. We had rumors that they were in there. Carden did have a lot of grayling and Bray had some lake trout in it.

 $\,$  And for future projects -- for research and monitoring projects in the Park planned for 2018 we

have the two weirs that are awaiting funding decision on whether they'll operate and then the burbot population assessment project will continue for another two years.

6 7 8 9

In the Federal subsistence fishery we issue Federal subsistence fishing permits at four locations in the Park and at the Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge. In 2017 we issued 337 Glennallen permits, 133 Chitina permits, and one Batzulnetas permit. Tables 2 through 4 at the back end of the text show historical reported and expanded harvest in these fisheries. For 2017 we're still awaiting returns of the harvest reports to have anything in there reported yet.

15 16 17

18

19

20

21 2.2

23

10

11

12

13

14

2

3 4

5

And in the fishery, 2017, with the preseason chinook salmon conservation concerns we had, in response to the very low pre-season run forecast for Copper River chinook salmon that was released by Fish and Game, management actions were taken in all up river fisheries, both State and Federal, during the early season with the intent of reducing chinook salmon harvest.

24 25 26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

The Wrangell-St. Elias superintendent issued two special actions under delegation of authority from the Federal Subsistence Board that delayed the season start date for the subsistence fishery in the Glennallen subdistrict from May 15th to June 1 and reduced the combined chinook salmon harvest limit for dipnet and rod and reel gear types for both Glennallen and Chitina subdistricts from ten to two. Actually, there's a type in your report. It says ten to five. But it was actually reduced to two.

35 36 37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

These special actions were issued after consultation with the Chair of the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission, Tribal Councils in the communities eligible to participate in the fishery, local management biologist of the Department of Fish and Game. And the actions are consistent with specific recommendation from the Subsistence Resource Commission.

45 46 47

48

As the season progressed, assessments of in river chinook salmon abundance indicated a higher abundance than forecast and a likelihood of achieving

sustainable escapement goals and on June 9th Federal restrictions were lifted and chinook salmon returned to the five by -- five by rod and reel.

And then presently we are reassessing Federal subsistence management in the Federal fishery of the Chitina subdistrict. We are actually inviting any comments and discussion you might have on this as we did with the SRC and we will with other Tribal and

other local -- any constituents.

So the Federal subsistence fishery in the Chitina subdistrict began in 2002 after being established by the Federal Subsistence Board during their December 2001 regulatory meeting. The approved regulatory language established a Federal subsistence fishing season and methods and means in the Chitina subdistrict identical to the Federal season and methods and means in place for the Glennallen subdistrict. The season is written to be from May 15th through September 30th.

Although the Federal season in the Chitina subdistrict was approved to be identical to that of the Glennallen subdistrict, a precautionary approach was discussed by the Board to allow time for an evaluation of Federal user effort and harvest in this subdistrict which could be used to adapt future management practices. The Federal Subsistence Board discussion provided intent and direction for the Federal subsistence fishery to be scheduled for at least the first year and more if necessary consistent with the State subsistence fishery in the Chitina subdistrict. And of note, since the time of the Board discussion, the State fishery in Chitina has been determined by the State Board of Fisheries to be classified as personal use instead of subsistence.

So from 2002 to '17, management efforts coordinated with the state -- or in management efforts coordinated with the State, the delegated Federal inseason management fishery has routinely special actions to open and close the Chitina subdistrict Federal subsistence fishery in a schedule that coincides with the openings of the State fishery in this subdistrict.

So evaluation of recent five and ten year averages, the participation and harvest has shown Federal use and harvest to be approximately one percent

of all use and harvest occurring in that subdistrict. And given this level of observed use and harvest, we are evaluating the justification of continuing to restrict Federal subsistence opportunity in this subdistrict. It's a restriction that is in effect based on the much higher level of use and harvest of the State personal use fishery in the subdistrict.

So that concludes that.

I invite any discussion on that.

It would be a major change from past practice; however, it may be what the intent originally was to see what happened. And, you know, there's also the factor that it's the same pool -- you know, mostly the same pool of applicant -- of users to the fisheries. Many of them utilize the fishwheel, some prefer dipnet perhaps, and some probably just avoid the crowds that are in Chitina. And this would give them freedom to be in the area when the State crowds were not there.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Questions.

Go ahead, Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Yes. Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Dave, especially your last paragraph is really valuable.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes.

MS. CAMINER: Because of course for us it's all about -- for everybody it's all about subsistence priority. So I mean that would be -- we encourage that evaluation to continue. And maybe you could just mention how, for example, the Tanada Creek weir might help in some of this evaluation or some of the in-season management.

MR. SARAFIN: Well, the Tanada Creek -- I mean the lower River Chitina -- you know, the early season of it could affect what makes it further up river. And we do intend -- what we envision anyways if we were to do this is we probably still may delay the opening date of Chitina from May 15. We've had voice from SRC and others that encouraged that. That maybe

May 15th is too early, especially the lower you are on the river because that's fish that are likely to make it further up like to Batzulnetas and Tanada.

So it is something we'll be monitoring and it's always a key component to have the weir there to make sure and assess what our management actions down river have done. And also with the -- there's a cooperative nature of the management of the Batzulnetas area, too, with the relatively small group of users that may participate in that fishery who have expressed a -- you know, have willingly cooperated with the concerns we've had in the past.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Rick.

 MR. GEASE: Yeah. In your report you talk about percentages of permits reported and then you have reported harvest and then you just do a simple scale up to harvest estimates. Have you validated that the people who are not reporting are fishing? Have you validated that assumption that the 20 percent or so or ten percent or so of permits that aren't being reported are actually fishing?

MR. SARAFIN: I haven't looked into that level. This is just to basically get reports coming in. What I do do -- we are sharing the data with Fish and Game. They prefer to have a basic lockout date on the database. And they do a more biometric expansion, where they include what -- their expansion of the Federal harvest. This I do just as I go.

 You know, I've reviewed some -- if I review the database, find some error or there may be a correction. I get reports in all the way into the next season. I add that in for extra information, but I'm not looking at the likelihood that the late reports or non-reports might not have fished compared to those that did. And so there is that factor that I haven't thrown in. This is just a basic expansion.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any other.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right. Very

 good. Thank you much. Very good.

Judy, you going to go?

MS. PUTERA: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is Judy Putera, wildlife biologist from Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve.

I will first present results from Dall sheep harvest -- Dall sheep surveys within the Park and Preserve. I work with my colleagues at the Tok area office Fish and Game and Glennallen area office Fish and Game to survey a number of sheep survey units throughout both GMU 11 and 12.

And the first three tables in the report are results from our sheep surveys in 2017 and we also have some previous data to show some trends. And I -- excuse me. I have separated the tables to indicate that Fish and -- this is -- some of this is Fish and Game data and they have given me permission to present it to you here.

The first table is a count -- or count area 7E. And I apologize. I realize I did not put the map in this report of where these count units are. But 70 is out in the Chisana area in GMU 12. So we are seeing a fairly stable number of sheep in this unit with an increase in the lamb/ewe ratio, ewe like ratio and the ram/ewe like ratio.

Under Table 2, count area 3 is also in the Chisana area. It's out at Ptarmigan -- I'm sorry. Count area 3 is actually -- it's a very large count unit that sort of spans GMU 11 and 12 and it's between the Nabesna River and the Copper River on the north side of the Wrangells.

We saw a very large increase in the population of sheep there since we last surveyed that unit in 2012. We had increases in both ram and lamb to ewe ratios. Count Unit 9 is back in GMU 12 in the Chisana area, out in Ptarmigan Lake. We again had increases in total number of sheep. Ram to ewe ratios were slightly decreased and lamb to ewe ratios were increased.

The next page. These two count areas are in unit 11 and they generally are surveyed every year or thereabouts. But this is really encouraging. Our count area 11 is -- I think it's in the -- between

the Chetaslina River and the -- anyway, it's -- oh, okay. The Chetaslina River and the Kotsina River, I think. Or the -- anyway, it's in that area. Total sheep have increased. As well I just want to draw your attention to the lamb per 100 ewe ratio of 53. It seems -- I mean it's really, really good. And also in unit 22 -- that is out in the upper Chitina River area -- we also had an increase in sheep and a very high lamb to ewe like ratio.

So we also have a project -- ongoing project with Alaska Department of Fish and Game with Tom Lohuis there. And we are looking at Dall sheep ram energetic survival and disbursal and their different harvest management regulations. That project began about a year ago.

 So that study area is basically actually between the Nabesna River and the Sanford River. It's not actually Drop Creek. It goes a little bit beyond that. In 2016, 40 rams were captured and fitted with GPS radio collars. Energetic parameters were measured both pre and post-rut. And then disease screening was also conducted on those captured rams.

The radio collared rams were radio tracked once each month to determine mortality. All collared rams were alive as recently as October 2017 and they actually came -- were out last week during the second year of the project. And all the rams were still alive.

He also -- Tom Lohuis also gave me just a really brief update. I asked him about the disease screening and he said there were no worries there. That everything looked good. So that was a positive note.

In conjunction with that sheep study, we also have another researcher from the University of Washington who's doing a -- she's gotten funding from NASA and she's doing a project to model snow using NASA satellite imaging and so forth on their satellites. But basically what she's doing is ground truthing the snow in the winter out there, so she's got stakes and time lapse cameras and different things like that. And so that will all be put in a model and it will help us to evaluate how snow conditions affect sheep movements and habitat use and things like that in the winter.

And that will be interesting as we have changes in our climate.

And there is website for that project. And I've put it there. And it's got some nice progress reports and it actually explains the project probably much better than I can do.

Okay. Moving on to caribou, we -- I've put down our last several population estimates for the Mentasta caribou herd. And as we talked about quite a bit when we were discussing the proposals, my fall herd size estimate for the Mentasta herd this year is 429 animals.

And the next table is basically our fall comp counts. And I've just included a lot of historical data there to kind of show all those years of very low cow -- calves per 100 cows there in the fall and how we're sort of improving those ratios in recent years.

 We also monitor the Chisana caribou herd, which is primarily in unit 12. On table six, this year we did a -- our all composition count. And I have just right now split the data between Alaska and Yukon. Generally, the Yukon folks do the Yukon side of the range and then the Alaska folks do the Alaska side of the range. And I haven't gotten all the raw data to join those, but anyway I reported each side. We comped over 500 caribou.

And our management plan says to keep this small subsistence harvest that we have going, we need to have a rolling three-year average of 20 calves per 100 cows and I think it's 35 bulls per 100 cows. So it looks like we are still able to keep that hunt going.

I also got some extra funding to do some habitat work for the Chisana caribou herd. Based on our management plan, there has been some speculation that we have a very low amount of lichen and a high amount of moss. There was some work done back in the '90s and early 2000s looking at vegetation composition from fecal pellets from the herd. So I went ahead and did a similar project in 2015 and '16 and this is what is presented in Table 7.

So went out and tracked our radio collared animals in the winter and a couple of days later or a day later we would go out to those areas with a helicopter, land, and pick up fecal pellets. And we did this, you know, several times throughout the winter. And our results are here. And I've put lichens and mosses -- they were the most prevalent in the fecal samples. And basically, you know, we have about -- I don't know, 40 -- probably about 46 percent over that, you know, average of lichen in the diet and mosses -- I don't know -- probably around 30 percent or so.

And just comparing that with other studies, the winter diets of 13 Yukon woodland (ph) caribou herds sampled between 1981 and 2001 were predominantly lichen. So 75 percent while moss made up only a minor component of the diets. So we do have quite a bit of moss in our winter diets for the Chisana caribou herd.

And then other studies have shown lichens to comprise over 50 percent of the winter diet of caribou herds in Alaska.

average.

So we are definitely under that

And then for Table 8 I've just took out the moss and lichen -- oh, I'm sorry. We did preliminary -- we did vegetation sampling in the summer throughout the range to see, you know, what our vegetation was like out there. And I've pulled just the moss and lichen data out of the overall table. So just to kind of compare with our results from the fecal samples.

So we had quite a bit more ground covering moss than lichens and we're of course interested in lichens because they're important winter forage. Because they're energy rich, highly palatable, and easily digested and mosses have extremely low nutritional value and digestibility compared to lichens.

So in terms of lichen cover, the Chisana caribou herd range has cover values that are within the range reported for most other woodland, bearing ground (ph) caribou herds of 13 to 24 percent

of all lichens and 8 to 11 percent for forage lichens. However, we observed very few dense lichen mats in our study area and we measured biomass — lichen biomass and we came up with 238 kilograms per hectare within the Chisana caribou range, which is very low compared to that of other Alaska caribou ranges and Yukon ranges, which can be up to 3,799 kilograms per hectare. So I think we have the distribution of lichen. We just don't have that high biomass of lichen in the Range.

And lastly we are also -- we plan to do our wolf population survey within the Range of the Chisana caribou herd in March, April of 2018. And this is also an action item in the Chisana caribou herd management plan.

And that's all I have.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Questions.

MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes. Go ahead.

MS. CELLARIUS: This is Barbara Cellarius, with Wrangell-St. Elias. And when you're done with any questions with Judy, I'd just like to have a few minutes as well.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Will do.

Any questions.

Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: Yeah. Can you speak briefly about the working groups? Tell them about that -- the night before the meeting?

MS. PUTERA: Right. Our superintendent, Ben Bobowski, convened folks that were interested in getting together to talk about our kind of three caribou herds and how we can work together to sort of fill information gaps and talk about management. So we had Fish and Game, Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge, of course Wrangell-St. Elias folks, BLM. Jesse Hankins was there. And then we invited members from the SRC and Ahtna, I believe, and AITRC.

And anyway, we had a really good discussion. And went around the room and everybody, you know, indicated what they were concerned about or what, you know, they'd like to see -- what they thought were data gaps and whatnot. So we did -- we had a really good discussion. We formed working groups. So we're going to work together to try to resolve a lot of these issues. And we'll just continue to be getting together to do this.

Thank you.

MS. CAMINER: Barb, this is Judy. And Greg had to step out of the room. So if you'll go ahead with your presentation, that would be great.

MS. CELLARIUS: Okay. Thank you.

At the end of the handout there's -- I had a couple of pages of information. The main thing I would mention is that we have set the quota for the winter moose hunt at seven bulls. You talked about the potential expansion of the season for that hunt. We didn't see any harvest of Chisana caribou herd this year. There is a table in the handout at the back that has some information on the Federal registration permits and also the joint State permit for the bull moose hunt in portions of Unit 11 and 12.

But what I really wanted to talk to you about was an action item that is on your agenda. I believe that you should have a handout that's on the Park letterhead that's labeled Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Subsistence Resource Commission. There's a photograph of the SRC at the bottom. Is that something that you've got in your packet?

MS. CAMINER: Give us a minute, Barb, to look for it. Or Donald can help us out here. We did have your other info though. Hold on.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Information....

MS. CELLARIUS: It was something I sent to Donald a month or so ago. And I can certainly move forward with my presentation if you don't find it. I just thought.....

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: We have it,

Computer Matrix, LLC 135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501

Barbara. We got it.

MS. CELLARIUS: Okay. Great. So I'm going to give you a short version of my presentation, but if there are questions I can go back and give you more details.

Under the provisions of ANILCA, Regional Advisory Councils appoint three members to each Subsistence Resource Commission. And in the case of the Southcentral RAC, you appoint one member to the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission. Currently, your appointee to the commission is Gloria Stickwan. In order to be eligible for these appointments, individuals must either serve on the Regional Advisory Council or serve on one of the local Fish and Game Advisory Committees.

21 22

Gloria's term expires this month. So you have an opportunity at this meeting to take action on this appointment. And I did talk to Gloria and she said she was interested in reappointment, so I haven't gone looking for Advisory Council members. Dan Stevens would also be eligible, but he's been appointed to the SRC by the Secretary of the Interior.

So I guess sort of turn it over to you. But would appreciate if you would be willing to either reappoint Gloria or appoint someone else to take action on this appointment in other words.

 $\mbox{CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Oh, okay.} \label{eq:chairman} \mbox{We're going to take care of that here in a second.}$ 

Go ahead, Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thanks, Barb and Donald for bringing this up to us.

Gloria, we appreciate that you're once again willing to serve and represent us and so I'd like to nominate that this RAC recommend appointment of Gloria Stickwan to the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Second.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Gloria has been nominated and seconded. Any discussion.

```
Page 287
                     (No comments)
 2
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: End of
 3
 4
     discussion. All in favor.
 5
                     (Laughter)
 6
 7
 8
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Gloria.
 9
                     MS. STICKWAN:
10
                                    I was just thinking if I
11
     don't get reappointment by the -- you know, the
     Secretary of the Interior that maybe Dan Stevens.
12
     don't get reappointed, is what I'm saying, to this RAC.
13
14
15
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Oh. To the RAC.
16
                     MS. STICKWAN: To the RAC.
17
18
19
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No chance.
20
                     MS. STICKWAN: That maybe Dan could be
21
2.2
     an alternate. Since he's -- you got your seat....
23
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: We'll cross that
24
25
     bridge when we get to it.
26
27
                     MS. STICKWAN:
                                    Okay.
                                           Okay.
28
29
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                          Is everyone good
30
     with that. All in favor -- is it unanimous.
31
                     IN UNISON: Yes.
32
33
34
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Unanimous
35
     consent. We appoint Gloria back to you.
36
37
                     (Laughter)
38
39
                     MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
40
41
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Mary has the same
     question on Denali. You think so? Okay. Go ahead.
42
43
                     MS. MCBURNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
44
     Yes. For the record, my name is Mary McBurney. I'm
45
     the subsistence team lead for the National Park Service
46
     Alaska Region. And I was asked here today by Amy
47
     Craver, the subsistence coordinator for Denali National
48
     Park. And Barbara provided me the perfect lead in to
49
50
```

```
Page 288
     the order of business that I am bringing before you
 2
     this afternoon.
 3
 4
                     There is a member of the Denali SRC
     whose seat is up for reappointment. And the
 5
     Southcentral RAC is the appointing authority for that
 6
 7
            And I am speaking about Jeff Burney. And for
     those of you that don't know Jeff, I have just a little
 8
     bit of biographical information I can share with you.
 9
10
     He's been a resident of Cantwell for quite some time.
11
     Since 1978. And he has also been a member of the local
     AC and the Denali SRC for about the past eight years.
12
13
                     He is a regular attendee and
14
15
     participant of the Denali SRC meetings and is someone
     that is pretty reliable for showing up and
16
     participating in those meetings. He also is a
17
     subsistence user that regularly hunts for moose in the
18
     area and he also is an active trapper in the Denali
19
     traditional use area. And that's the information I
20
     have on Jeff. And Denali National Park and the SRC
21
2.2.
     requests that he be reappointed to the Denali SRC.
23
24
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                           Okay.
                                                  We got
25
     that.
26
                     Would you like to make a -- oh, Gloria.
27
28
29
                     MS. STICKWAN:
                                    I was wondering.
30
     Eleanor -- is she online? Or is she interested? Or
     her seat's up next year? Or what's -- is she going to
31
     apply again or what?
32
33
34
                     (No comment)
35
                     MR. MIKE: Eleanor, are you still with
36
     us? And Gloria was asking if your seat's still up-to-
37
     date? Or what's the status of your seat on the SRC for
38
     Denali?
39
40
41
                     (No comment)
42
                     MR. MIKE: Eleanor, are you still with
43
44
     us?
45
46
                     (No comment)
47
48
                     MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.
49
50
```

```
Page 289
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                           Go ahead, Judy.
 1
 2
                     MS. CAMINER: I think Gloria, we might
 3
 4
     have appointed Eleanor last year.
 5
 6
                     UNIDENTIFIED VOICE:
                                          Recently.
 7
 8
                     MS. CAMINER:
                                          And we have
                                  Yeah.
 9
     appointed Jeff before, so you're right. Probably her
10
     term is not up yet.
11
                     MS. STICKWAN: Is she still on there?
12
13
                     MS. CAMINER:
14
                                   Oh, yes.
15
                     MS. STICKWAN: She would still be
16
     reporting to us?
17
18
19
                     MS. CAMINER: Oh, definitely.
20
                     MS. STICKWAN: Because I've heard more
21
2.2
     reports from her than Jeff McBurney. But....
23
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: So is that
24
25
     cleared up. We've still got one and we're reappointing
26
     the other one again.
27
28
                     MS. CAMINER:
                                   Right.
29
30
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.
                                                   Okay.
                                                          Now
     I'll let you speak.
31
32
33
                     MS. CAMINER: Okay. Mr. Chair, I move
34
     that the Council recommend that Jeff Burney be
35
     reappointed to the Denali Subsistence Resource
     Commission. We were asked about him a few years ago
36
     and it's good to hear he seems to be doing a good job
37
38
     and like to see him reappointed.
39
40
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                           Okay.
                                                   Is there a
41
     second to that one.
42
                     MS. SELANOFF: I'll second.
43
44
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Seconded by
45
46
     Diane. Okay.
47
48
                     Is everyone in agreement with that one
49
     also. So we've got a unanimous agreement.
50
```

Page 290 (No opposing votes) 2 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well, so 3 4 be it. We'll appoint him unanimously. Thank you. 5 MS. MCBURNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 6 7 8 And before I leave the table I would like to draw your attention that Denali National Park 9 10 did submit a very nice report that begins on page 258 11 in your book. And there you will find survey information from their latest sheep, caribou, and moose 12 surveys, as well as the most recent information on 13 their monitoring efforts with brown bears and wolves. 14 15 16 And finally, there's also a very nice report in there about Amy Craver's project regarding 17 the traditional place names project that she's been 18 working on for the past couple of years. 19 20 Thank you. 21 2.2 23 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Thank you, Mary. Very good. We'll do some reading. 24 25 Okay, Donald. I'm looking at the 26 agenda. Are we wanting to come back tomorrow or are we 27 wanting to finish up today? Or do we want to go to 28 lunch? 29 30 (Laughter) 31 32 33 MS. CAMINER: Let's keep going. 34 35 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I think we could keep going if it's okay with the Council. And we'll 36 37 just wrap it up. 38 39 MS. STICKWAN: Yep. 40 41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Is that okay with 42 everyone. Okay. BLM. 43 MR. HANKINS: Mr. Chair, Members of the 44 Council, for the record, my name is Jesse Hankins. 45 a biologist with BLM in Glennallen. And Donald has 46 informed me that I have approximately 85 minutes from 47 48 past meetings that I have not used, so..... 49 50

(Laughter)

 MR. HANKINS: I'm just joking. I'm going to provide a report here. I put this on your desk on day one. It's an agency report on behalf of BLM. If you'd like to reference that as I through this, we can look at this together.

Just a general update, the Bureau of Land Management and ADF&G has entered into a cooperative agreement. The main objective of that agreement is looking cooperatively at subsistence resource species within GMU 13 on Federal public lands and our adjacent State managed lands.

Primarily, those efforts are focused on moose and caribou, large subsistence resources in Unit 13; however, there is an opportunity to look at other things, such as furbearers. I like to point that out. We entered into that agreement last year and have been working cooperatively on radio collaring moose and comp counts, things of that nature. I've had the opportunity to get into a Super Cub and help do some comp counts, so that's enjoyable.

Moving on to Unit 13 moose, just kind of an update on moose. Weather conditions were not suitable for an abundance estimate in 2016. About this time last year we were trying to get in the air and do what's called a geospatial population estimate in 13B, which encompasses a lot of BLM public lands open for Federal subsistence. Weather conditions did not cooperate and that survey was not completed; however, there were some more opportunistic type comp surveys that were completed within those subunits. And report that all of 13, with the exception of 13A, were at or above objectives for bull/cow ratios. And those are objectives set by the State of Alaska. 25 to 100 for that bull/cow ratio.

We're hoping to get in the air this year again if conditions are right to do a population estimate. And that will be BLM supporting ADF&G in that effort. And hopefully I can get in the air again in a contracted Super Cub and help out in that manner.

Looking at GMU 13 caribou, the last photo census was conducted in 2016. At that time they reported a minimum herd count of 49,550 caribou. And

that last regulatory year approximately 6,000 caribou were harvested in that 16/17 season.

The weather bugs -- temperature didn't cooperate this year. The caribou didn't really group like they would hope, so they were not able to conduct their photo census. Looking at some information available to them, it was estimated the herd's probably at around 50,000 caribou going into this hunting season.

So that's just kind of a brief update on the moose and caribou. I wanted to point out that our staff at Glennallen is quite proud of our hunt report return rate. I mentioned it earlier in the meetings, but last year's Federal moose hunt, almost 1,400 permits issued and we had a 97 percent return rate, so that's something we're proud of.

 Getting those hunt reports back, I think that's important. And we're sharing that information with the State actually on almost a weekly basis. Letting those guys know what we're having for a harvest and sharing that information. So happy with that 95 percent return rate on caribou.

So just wanted to point that out.

Put a plug in for ourselves.

(Laughter)

MR. HANKINS: And the subsistence users for returning that report to us.

Turning over to the next page, we'll look at the moose harvest status in GMU 13. Just the table there at the top of the page showing what we've issued this year. We issued 1,398 moose permits this year. Of those approximately half the people attempted use on that permit. Those individuals may also have State permits in their hunting on that opportunity as well, but typically about half the people issued permits do actively hunt on that permit. And we had 89 bulls harvested this year. Again, that's any antlered bull.

 $\,$  And just as part of that reporting process, they report the number of times and antler

spread. And we can get at some of the information to share with the State what portion of the Federal bulls might meet the State hunt requirement as well. The spike fork, 50-inch or the four brow tine. And this year it's approximately about a third of that harvest would meet that State requirement.

We're slightly above the five-year average for bulls harvested within Unit 13. At this time we have 88 percent of the hunt reports reported. Our hunter success number will likely go down a little bit as those hunt reports filter in, but quite similar to what we've seen in years past on our five-year average. Again you can see we continue to issue more and more permits year after year, but harvest seems to be fairly stable.

We'll flip this over to look at the last page. Look at caribou harvest status. This hunt is an ongoing hunt. This hunt closes on March 31st. So this data is incomplete at this time. But issued 3,025 permits to date. We have a harvest of 322 caribou. That's as of I guess Sunday. Again, the information is very premature. At this time a lot of hunts haven't been reported. In fact, there's people that still have an opportunity to go out there and harvest critters; however, a lot of the Nelchina herd has left the Nelchina Basin and you'll work hard to get a caribou in Unit 13 at this time.

 There was a lot of opportunity early in the year. Say the month of August there seemed to be a lot of caribou in and around Federal public lands and there was a fair amount of harvest occurring. There was a fairly big push in August and then it kind of slowed down. And then another big push there in September. And we don't anticipate a whole lot more harvest occurring in this winter season. With that said, there's always resident caribou within the unit that folks can -- that can work to get at, but likely we'll not see much more harvest coming up in the winter months.

That is my 85-minute report in about six minutes, so if you have any questions I can entertain those.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. We've got Gloria. Go ahead.

```
Page 294
                     MS. STICKWAN: I don't understand.
                                                          You
     said one-third of the harvest for moose of the 89.
 2
     that one-third of 89 are the restricted -- you can pull
 3
 4
     that out and say that they have restricted antlers? Is
     that what you meant? I don't understand what you
 5
     meant.
 6
 7
 8
                     MR. HANKINS:
                                   Okay.
                                          Through the Chair.
     Of those 89 bulls harvested, one-third of them
 9
10
     approximately would meet the State requirement for
11
     either being a spike, a fork, 50 inches wide or having
     four brow tines.
12
13
                     MS. STICKWAN: And to just let you
14
15
     know, somebody in the audience took a picture of
     caribou in Glennallen. About ten miles out of
16
     Glennallen. It was on Facebook.
17
18
19
                     MR. HANKINS: Interesting.
     There are no Federal public lands there, Gloria.
20
21
2.2
                     MS. STICKWAN:
                                    That was just on Sunday.
23
                     UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible -
24
25
     away from mic)
26
                     MS. STICKWAN: We don't care about
27
28
     that.
29
30
                     MR. HANKINS:
                                    Okay.
31
                     (Laughter)
32
33
34
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: She's looking for
35
     the caribou.
36
                     MR. HANKINS: Yeah.
37
38
39
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any other
40
     questions for Jesse here.
41
                     (No comments)
42
43
44
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Good report.
     Very punctual.
45
46
                     MR. HANKINS:
                                   Yeah.
47
48
                                            Thank you very
49
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
50
```

```
Page 295
     much. A lot of information. Appreciate it.
 2
                     Okay. What do we got next.
 3
 4
 5
                     We got ADF&G.
 6
 7
                     (No comments)
 8
 9
                     MS. CAMINER: I think they're gone.
10
11
                     (Laughter)
12
13
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Man, they blew
     it.
14
15
                     (Laughter)
16
17
18
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: They did
     everything they could all along.
19
20
                     How about OSM. Anyone.
21
2.2
23
                     (No comments)
24
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Tom, do you want
25
26
     to say some parting thoughts?
27
28
                     MR. DOOLITTLE: I do. Being last I can
     be brief, correct?
29
30
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                            Sure.
31
32
33
                     MS. CAMINER: You could.
34
35
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You could, but
     there's a time limit on this thing, you know. You
36
     notice it's got a big asterisk on it.
37
38
39
                      MR. DOOLITTLE: I gathered that, Mr.
     Chair.
40
41
                      My name is Tom Doolittle.
                                                  I'm the
42
     deputy assistant regional director for OSM and
43
     providing a Staff report to the Council.
44
45
                     And I know that I am last, so I will be
46
     brief. And apologies for an oral report, but I think
47
     it's best to do it this way after listening to what I
48
     see as a very well rounded and thoughtful Council. And
49
50
```

I have appreciated the dialogue because to me this is one of the hearts and souls of our process -- and with you and the public. And so I first wanted to extend that personal thanks and programmatic thanks, you know, to the Council and for the opportunity to report to you, for the hospitality of this Refuge, to the Community of Homer and the public for attending this meeting.

We've had a few Staff changes in the last year. Jennifer Hardin has moved into a new position internally. Christine Brummer is a new Staff member and myself. And I'm going to give you just a brief overview about these individuals and some of their qualifications.

21 22

Jennifer, who you've met, was an internal lateral transfer into a vacant policy coordinator position at OSM. She has been a quick study of ANILCA since she's been at OSM, is an expert at subsistence law and policy. Dr. Hardin has experience with multiple Federal agencies and Tribal entities. In a prior life she was an American Indian liaison and park anthropologist at Yosemite National Park. Previously with OSM she was the anthropology division supervisor and was an acting fishery division supervisor, which has given her a breadth of experience to excel at her position as policy coordinator.

Since Jennifer was the former anthropology lead, this has created a vacancy in our anthropology division, so we'll need to hire a new position for that.

Christine Brummer was hired as a Pathway student. And Pathway's program is a bridge between students to encourage permanent Federal employment. You know, and it starts at a formative stage while they're in school. Both college and graduate school. Christine is attending UAA as an anthropology student in the Pathways program and is a bridge, as I said, to Federal employment. She is from Anchorage, with two bachelor's degrees, and is pursuing her master's degree in Anthropology. And she's doing a wonderful job in her last few months.

I took Chuck Ardizzone's job and I was told to do a brief bio about myself. And so I won't start from about when I started my interest in natural

resource management at the age of five, but we can go on from there. I started my career with the National Park Service at the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore on Lake Superior, in Northern Wisconsin. And then working for 12 years as a fish and wildlife biologist and program supervisor and as a law enforcement supervisor and warden for the Bad River Band, a Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians. This included the reservation, Western Lake Superior Tribal commercial fisheries, home use fisheries, and the ceded territories which were the public lands of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

Then I came to Alaska as a supervisory fish and wildlife biologist and later became the deputy Refuge manager at Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge. I was stationed in Bethel, Alaska, for seven years. After my tenure in Western Alaska I went to Wisconsin to reconnect with five new grandchildren that I really hadn't met, so that was one of those great personal decisions, and conduct a sharp-tailed grouse restoration project for the United States Forest Service. And once I had that program secure and running, I went to the Tongass National Forest for a short stint supervising the Fish and Wildlife Subsistence and Water Management Program on Prince of Wales Island, in Southeast Alaska, before accepting my position at OSM last January.

So it's good to be back and it's great to -- you know, to introduce some our Staff changes.

Another thing, just like any organization we've had retirements. Palma Ingles was an anthropologist and she retired after a long tenure in government service. Don Rivard retired from OSM as a fishery biologist after 32 years of Federal service. Sabrina Schmidt left our front desk because her husband was reassigned to a military duty station in Las Vegas.

And so we are essentially down four positions. We will attempt to get waivers and we are in a -- what I call a hiring freeze. And right now we're at -- I called it a snow -- a very slow melt to try to hire new positions within the agency right now. Our waivers need to go to Washington, D.C. to get approvals and be aware that it may take at least a year to refill some of these positions.

We are still awaiting approvals from the Department of Interior to publish the January 2017 Board approved fish regulations in the Federal Register. There has been heavy scrutiny of those regulations passed within the last 90 days of the last administration and this review has taken a long time.

We are consistently trying to move forward with this regulatory process, but no recent news on that. We definitely hope to see those regulations move forward in the near future. The regulations are at the printer, but need to be in the Federal Register before printing or we cannot enforce the new regulations. All previous regulations are in effect since the new regulations are considered revisions of the past regulations.

21 22

 OSM is pleased that our wildlife cycle was approved by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service headquarters and the Department of Interior, resulting in our process moving forward. That our RACs and our Board are functioning as usual. And this includes our nomination packages to appoint new RAC members. So it's not all being stalled back. Is that many part of our process under the new administration is moving forward, which we're pleased to see.

A preliminary budget for subsistence in the coming year is looking about the same as last year. The president's budge and the recent past budget of the House for subsistence looks very similar to last year's budget as well. We still have the Senate and president to go. We are on a continuing resolution until early December and there is still a possibility in this later process of large cuts, but so far so good for our base of operations.

So when we look at the advocacy for subsistence at a variety of different levels from -- you know, people from the State of Alaska and the public -- it has definitely spoken to what we've seen in the preliminary budget process, so we are thankful for that as a program. Still operating like most Federal agencies as we've looked and reviewed the FRMP process at a lower level.

We are continuing -- and I know one agenda item that was brought up was where we were at with our MOU between the State and OSM. The last

meeting on that, that included people from OSM and the Forest Service and BLM, was in April of 2017. There have been edits on a draft document by both agencies and ADF&G. There are obviously ongoing issues that this Council has addressed very well, both with the Ahtna agreement, along with the Kenai gillnet fishery issues, and then in Western Alaska with Kuskokwim issues.

So there's still some aspects that are part of that MOU that are involving the complexity of some of these issues that have made this process slow. But again it is on our docket to keep moving forward with this. And after this RAC meeting I can see very clearly on why -- you know, that this RAC is solution-based and providing great information to the Board. And seeing recent signatures on agreements with NTC and a solid working relationship between the agencies and fisheries, I see that we're moving forward on many of these complex issues. And so that will help the MOU process out.

In closing, I would like to thank the Staff -- the OSM Staff for putting this together and the great work that they do. The partners, the agencies, of course the RAC, and the public. I cannot overstate more that this is one of the world's best examples of wildlife and fish management as a bottom up process of participation and working through issues in a consensus process to bring to a Federal Board -- and a Board that represents both the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture.

And I'll do my best to answer any questions that you might have.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Very good. Great report and consensus. Yeah.

Okay. Questions for Tom.

MS. CAMINER: One quick question.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Judy.

 MS. CAMINER: Thanks, Tom. Really appreciate the thoroughness of that report. And our sympathies on the hiring process. We know it's always an ordeal.

We've been, you know, pleased to have Donald as our coordinator for many, many years. And at one point we heard there would be a transition, but we just wondered if you could give us an update on that situation.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Well, there's really not much to update on the transition. And I'm one that likes to keep things that work.

## (Laughter)

 MR. DOOLITTLE: And so Donald, I can't appreciate more the extra work that you have done and his participation with you and the Council and to have that positive feedback on Donald. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Gloria.

2.2

MS. STICKWAN: I couldn't understand what you said about the MOA. Are you talking about the State and Federal? There are just disagreements? They're just still working on it. Is that what you said?

MR. DOOLITTLE: No. We wanted to make sure that we set a clear pathway so we knew exactly how we were going to serve the interests of Ahtna and to make sure that we had clear direction. And also a lot of the interests that the Ahtna region have just don't include Federal lands alone. They include obviously the State lands and State jurisdictions as well.

MS. STICKWAN: Did you even mention the MOA with the State? Did you say something about that?

MS. CAMINER: Yes.

MS. STICKWAN: What did he say? I guess I heard MOA, but I didn't understand what.

MR. DOOLITTLE: Just to make sure that we accommodate the interests of intertribal organizations such as Ahtna. There's also the InterTribal Fishery Commission out on the Kuskokwim. So there's a number of groups that are private committee and resource management groups that are

Page 301 involved now more in the Federal program than they have been in the past, which is both encouraged, but also we 2 need to make sure we reflect those responsibilities as 3 4 they form and make sure we know those responsibilities are clear when we're working with our partners. 5 6 7 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anything else. 8 9 (No comments) 10 11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, Tom. a pleasure to have you. And it seems like you've got a 12 good handle on her. So we look forward to working with 13 It's great. Thank you. 14 15 16 MR. DOOLITTLE: You run a great meeting, Chair. 17 18 19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. 20 Donald, it looks like we've got to come 21 2.2 up with a confirmation, the 2018 dates. And I know you've got them there. And there's no hassle, there's 23 no conflict. So it's all set in stone, right? 24 25 26 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. On page 265 you can just reconfirm your winter meeting 27 dates, which was scheduled for March 6th and 7th in 28 29 Anchorage. 30 And I handed out an updated fall 31 meeting calendar for 2018 and it's in front of you. 32 Once you confirm your winter meeting dates and then the 33 34 Council can move to plan for the fall 2018 meeting 35 date. Thank you, Mr. Chair. 36 37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty. 38 39 Thank you. 40 41 Any conflicts. Is that going to work. (No comments) 42 43 44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Everybody got it on their calendar. Is that going to work okay. 45 46 (No comments) 47 48 49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I think we just 50

```
Page 302
     confirmed it, Donald. We're good to go.
 2
 3
                     Fall.
                           That's a whole other story.
 4
 5
                     MR. GEASE: For the fall meeting, could
 6
     we get clarification if Donald has conflicts.
 7
 8
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Go ahead,
     Donald.
 9
10
11
                     MR. MIKE: Yes. If you look at your
    updated fall 2018 calendar, I also coordinate the
12
    Bristol Bay Region and they selected the November 6th
13
     and 7th. So that's the only dates you can avoid.
14
    -- and also we have to avoid AFN week. It's just so
15
     busy for everyone. Thank you.
16
17
18
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                           How about just
19
    before Halloween. The 29th, 30th, does that work for
     everyone.
20
21
2.2
                     MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.
23
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Judy.
24
25
26
                     MS. CAMINER: Could I just suggest we
     do Tuesday, Wednesday. Because we were thinking of
27
     folks who've got travel time. Or Wednesday, Thursday.
28
     You know, anything. But Tuesday, Wednesday maybe.
29
30
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right. Yeah.
31
     I just mentioned the 31st, Halloween. Some people like
32
     to be home for it. I know. So we could make Monday,
33
34
     Tuesday work for a change, I think, if we need to.
35
                     MS. CAMINER:
36
                                   Okay.
37
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: If you've got to
38
39
     travel on Sunday, you've got to -- and they don't pay
     us for travel anyway, so it don't matter.
40
41
                     MR. GEASE: Is there an issue for
42
     potentially doing the 22nd and 23rd or something like
43
     that. Or the 23rd and 24th, the week before.
44
45
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That's what we're
46
     looking at. Yeah. There's a Nome.....
47
48
                     MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair, just for your
49
50
```

Page 303 information, you know, we don't like to schedule more than three meetings in a week because we have Staff 2 that we have to move around to attend these meetings 3 4 and participate at these public meetings of the 5 Council. 6 7 Thank you. 8 9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. How about 10 29th and 30th of October then tentatively. Or as 11 tentative as could be. Does that work. Monday, 12 Tuesday. 13 14 Is that going to work, Andy? 15 make it work? 16 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: That doesn't work with 17 the way my days of travel go, so I might not be able to 18 attend that. 19 20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. 21 I'm not. 2.2. sure what we could do. We..... 23 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: You're never going to 24 25 be able to make everybody happy. 26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. Yeah. 27 28 Okay. We'll try that. 29 30 MR. GEASE: Well, we could do the 5th and 6th or this -- oh, you can't do it that way. 31 32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Uh-huh. 33 34 35 Okay. 29th, 30th. I guess we'll hang on that. Where that's going to be -- going to be at 36 37 your place in Anchorage, I quess. 38 MS. CAMINER: If the next one will be 39 in Anchorage, do we want this one to be somewhere else? 40 41 This might..... 42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Oh. This is the 43 fall meeting. 44 45 MS. CAMINER: Right. Right. 46 47 48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. Yeah. Okay. Yeah. This one could be anywhere. It could be 49 50

```
Page 304
     in Tetlin.
 2
 3
                     (Laughter)
 4
 5
                     MS. STICKWAN: It will be fisheries,
     right?
 6
 7
 8
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                            It will be
 9
                 Yeah. Anyone got a preference. Okay.
     fisheries.
10
     We'll decide at the next meeting.
11
12
                     (Laughter)
13
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
14
                                            That gives you
15
     plenty of time. Okay, Donald?
16
                     You guys all think about it and we'll
17
18
     get some suggestions to him.
                                   Okav.
19
                     Okay. We've got that done. We've got
20
     one last closing comments for the Council.
21
2.2
23
                     And I don't know if Eleanor is still
              I think we lost her. Or maybe she's not
     online.
24
25
     there. But I think we'll just start with Diane and
     we'll work our way around this way. Okay.
26
27
28
                     MS. SELANOFF:
                                    Sounds good. So I just
     wanted to thank you for a good meeting this week and
29
30
     also do a shout out to Judy for -- you know, when I
     first came in she came over and made sure that I
31
     understood what the expectations were and made me very
32
     comfortable right away.
33
34
35
                     And then also, too, to Andy for doing
     the mentoring.
                     Taking me under his wing and saying --
36
     so I really appreciate that.
37
38
39
                     It's been a good experience to see --
     actually be at a meeting and sit down and see how this
40
41
     process works. And I'm looking forward to -- now that
     I do understand it a little bit better how I can better
42
     service the people that I represent in this area and
43
     the subsistence needs and how to bring those proposals
44
     forward to make changes to help them with their
45
     subsistence processes.
46
47
48
                     Anyway, thank you.
49
50
```

Page 305 Safe travels home, everyone. 2 3 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Diane. 4 5 Andy. 6 7 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Thank you. 8 Just good meeting. Some tough issues. 9 10 Thanks to Donald for all the 11 organization of everything and reiterating what was just said with the closing comments there. 12 13 That's it for me. 14 15 16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Dan. 17 18 MR. STEVENS: Thanks. It was a good meeting. This is a learning curve for me also. 19 starting to understand a lot more process of different 20 agencies besides the Wrangell-Saint and everything else 21 2.2 I've stood on. 23 So this is a learning curve and thank 24 25 you for the time. 26 27 It was a good meeting. 28 29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Judy. 30 MS. CAMINER: We did have some really 31 good discussions and appreciate everybody's energy and 32 attention and input. I think that the more we 33 34 discussed, the better our decisions became. And some of them maybe were surprising, but I think that was the 35 result of some good sharing of information. So thanks 36 to everyone who helped make it happen. 37 38 39 And one thought in future meetings, I always feel badly especially for BLM to be the last, 40 41 last one. So maybe we -- almost last one -- OSM. maybe we could think about the Agency reports 42 occasionally at the beginning. It might be helpful for 43 some of our discussions, too. So we might mix it up. 44 45 46 Thank you. 47 48 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Judy. 49 50

```
Page 306
                     Gloria.
 2
                     MS. STICKWAN: I just want to say thank
 3
 4
     you for listening to our proposals and the long
     discussion and patience. I thought it was a good
 5
     meeting and I look forward to seeing more if I get
 6
 7
     reappointed.
 8
 9
                     Thank you.
10
11
                     (Laughter)
12
13
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
     Gloria.
14
15
                     Michael.
16
17
18
                     MR. OPHEIM: Well, good meeting.
     to see all the new people on -- and really good
19
20
     discussions.
21
2.2
                     Really educational.
23
                     Learned a lot.
24
25
26
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Ricky.
27
28
                     MR. GEASE: Good meeting. Glad to see
     everybody here. And thanks to the Islands and Ocean
29
30
     Center for hosting us here. And a great space to have
     a meeting down here in Homer.
31
32
33
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                            Ed.
34
35
                     MR. HOLSTON:
                                  Yeah.
                                           I'm one of the new
     people, so this has been quite a learning experience
36
     for me. I appreciate all the help I've received from
37
     Donald and you, Greg, and Ricky. I feel a lot more
38
     comfortable this meeting than I did my first meeting,
39
     so hopefully my knowledge and effectiveness will
40
41
     improve.
42
                     So thank you all for your help.
43
44
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you much,
45
     all of you.
46
47
48
                     I'm going to make a couple of comments.
49
50
```

Page 307 One comment, I think it was a good meeting, too, and I think we had some very good debate. 2 And I think we put the subsistence user first and we 3 4 really vetted the process. And that's a bottom up approach and that's the way it's supposed to work. And 5 I think it's working that way. 6 7 8 The one thing that I would kind of request or remind that -- that proponent of the 9 10 proposal, I like to see them at the meeting and talk to 11 the issue. And in a couple of cases we didn't quite have that. But anyway, that's very good. 12 13 14 And I thank all of the people that come 15 here. And Tom Doolittle and Jennifer, congratulations sliding over and up or wherever you're going, but it 16 sounds good. 17 18 19 (Laughter) 20 I know I give Jess a bad time, but he 21 2.2 does a lot of hard work. Appreciate everyone. Scott 23 and everyone, you guys did awesome. Milo, tell Old Tom that, you know, he's just going to have to take the 24 luck of the draw. But other than that.... 25 26 27 (Laughter) 28 29 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: And Tom Evans, 30 you stood a hard course there. 31 But anyway, thank you guys all. 32 Thank everyone. And with that I'm ready to move on. 33 34 35 MS. CAMINER: Motion to adjourn. 36 37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: We've got a 38 motion to adjourn. Second. 39 MS. SELANOFF: I'll second. 40 41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Seconded. 42 43 44 MR. HOLSTON: Second. 45 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Seconded, Ed. 46 47 48 We stand adjourned. Thank you. 49 50

		Page	308
	(055	_ 3.53	
1 2	(Off record)		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(END OF PROCEEDINGS)		
4			
6			
7			
8			
10			
11 12			
13			
13 14 15			
16			
17			
18 19			
20			
21			
20 21 22 23			
24 25			
26			
26 27			
28 29			
30			
31 32			
34			
35			
33 34 35 36 37 38 39			
38			
40			
41 42			
43			
44			
44 45 46 47 48			
47			
48			
50			

```
CERTIFICATE
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
 4
                                      )ss.
 5
     STATE OF ALASKA
                                      )
 6
             I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the
 7
     state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court
 8
     Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:
 9
10
11
             THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through
      ___ contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the
12
     SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY
13
     COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II taken electronically on the
14
15
     7th day of November in Homer, Alaska;
16
                     THAT the transcript is a true and
17
     correct transcript requested to be transcribed and
18
     thereafter transcribed by under my direction and
19
     reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and
20
     ability;
21
2.2.
23
                     THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or
     party interested in any way in this action.
24
25
26
                     DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 19th
     day of November 2017.
27
28
29
30
                             Salena A. Hile
31
                             Notary Public, State of Alaska
32
                             My Commission Expires: 09/16/18
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
```